Armenian Philosophical Academy

Virgil B. Strohmeyer

The Importance of Teseo Ambrogio degli Albonesi's Selected Armenian Materials for the Development of the Renaissance's Perennial Philosophy and an Armenological Philosophical Tradition

Yerevan - 1998

Armenian Philosophical Academy

Վիրջիլ Սպրոմայեր

Թեզեո Ամբրոջիո դելի Ալբոնեզի Հայերեն Նյութերի
ժողովածուի դերը Վերածնության դարաշրջանի
Հարատև փիլիսոփայության զարգացման և
Հայագիտական փիլիսոփայական ավանդույթի
սկզբնավորման գործում

Երևան   1998

Armånskaå Filosofskaå Akademiå

VirdΩil Stromaier

**Znacenie Izbrannyx Armånskix Materialov Tezeo AmbrodΩio Delhi
Alhbonezi V Razvitii Vecnoj Filosofii ‰poxi VozroΩdeniå i Armånskoj
Filosofskoj Tradi†ii**

Erevan   **1998**

Armenian Philosophical Academy

Virgil B. Strohmeyer

The Importance of Teseo Ambrogio degli Albonesi's Selected Armenian Materials for the Development of the Renaissance's Perennial Philosophy and an Armenological Philosophical Tradition

The Publishing House of the NAS RA "Gitutyun"

Yerevan   1998

Published by the authority of the Presidium of the Armenian Philosophical Academy

Reviewers:

Strohmeyer, V. B.

Ս 906

The Importance of Teseo Ambrogio degli Albonesi's Selected Armenian Materials for the Development of the Renaissance's Perennial Philosophy and an Armenological Philosophical Tradition./ Editor-in-Charge, B. Vaux - Yerevan - The Publishing House of the NAS RA "Gitutyun" 1998 150 pages.

This work examines the philosophical influences of the Armenian language and texts upon the esoteric studies of Ambrogio Teseo, Guillaume Postel, and Francisco Rivola. A detailed commentary on all of their Armenian texts is included.

Գ. Ասատրյան, ֆ.գ.դ., պրոֆեսոր, ԵՊՀ Իրանագիտության ամբիոնի վարիչ

Ա. Գուլդման, ֆ.գ.դ., ֆիլիսոփայության պրոֆեսոր, Ֆորիդայի Արվեստի ինստիտուտի Նախագահ, ԱՄՆ

Ա. Սաֆարյան, պատմ. գ., դոց., ԵՊՀ Թուրքագիտության ամբիոնի վարիչ

Ա. Տրակինա, ֆ.գ.դ., պրոֆեսոր, Լեչչեի Համալսարան, Իտալիա, ԲՄՇ անդամ

Երաշխավորված է

ԵՊՀ Թուրքագիտության ամբիոնի կողմից

Հրատարակության պատասխանատու խմբագիր

Բերթ Վոգս, ֆ.գ.դ. Հարվարդի Համալսարանի պրոֆեսոր, ԱՄՆ

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements and Concerns

My search for information on the topic above has led me to many interesting nooks and crannies of the scholastic world. I encountered Teseo Ambrogio originally because of a friend, Dr. Paul Gehl, who is the curator of incunables at the Newberry in Chicago. He asked

me during a visit if I would like to see their collection of early Armenian books: three 17th century religious manuscripts (described by the late Prof. Sanjian) and Ambrogio.

Most of my work was subsequently done at the Vatican Library and I would like to thank Father Boyle, its chief, for his kindest help in circumventing the normal and understandable procedures, which would have allowed me little time for research if I had been forced to adhere to them.

My indebtedness to all those at the library of the University of Pavia is mentioned below. They were very kind in getting microfilms of Ambrogio's manuscripts to me in Armenia, and that was done without prior payment and with some trust in the honesty of scholars. In Italy I was more than generously aided by Prof. Mauro Zonta, Prof. Ricardo Contini, Prof. Alessandro Orengo, Prof. Giusto Traina, and Prof. Levon Zekiyan.

In Armenia, Prof. Garnik Asatrian has always been a good friend and a person to bring the thorniest problem with every hope of help in solving it. I would like to express my special gratitude to Academician Gevork Jahukian, whose pioneering work on Renaissance Armenian grammars has given so much to my understanding of the problems involved, and who, as director of the Linguistics Institute, has acted as 'kavor' for the realization of my project. There has been another 'kavor' as well; Academician Gevork Brutian has most charitably advised me through many a bureaucratic thicket, while at the same time making me aware of the profound philosophical implications (implicit, explicit, contextual and subtextual) in any work of translation: especially a work such as Ambrogio's that opened Europe's eyes to the treasures possessed by their Oriental Christian brethern.

Finally, all of the workers at the Matenadaran deserve my special thanks, for much of my work was accomplished there and so many scholars working at that institution were ready to answer a question or discuss a problem. I would especially like to thank Dr. Gohar Mouradian, The late and lamented Professor Papazian, the late and lamented Deputy Director, Babken Choogaszian and the Director, Sen Arevshetian.

No acknowledgement is complete without the acknowledgement of those, whose love and care, kept the writer writing through the hardest times of cold and dark in the Armenian winters of the 90's: my wife, Isabella Sarkissova-Strohmeyer and my daughter Anna Lisa. Isabella more than ably translated the Armenian summaries to my books (which are probably more stylish than the English originals) and was the one who encouraged and properly upbraided me when things seemed bleakest; as for Anna Lisa, I can only ask her forgiveness that I had to keep the fascinating keyboard of my computer away from her small hands for such long periods.

Besides the works described here, I have found a number of pertinent materials in the Vatican's manuscript collection, especially documents on the conversion of Armenians to Catholicism: there are two transcriptions of Armenian texts into Latin letters done with the help of the Armenian catachumens dating from the middle of the 16th century, which I will include in a susequent study.

For the liturgists, I have discovered a Latin manuscript translation of the Armenian Liturgy (worked on by Teseo in the 1520s) that is in the Univrsity of Rome's Alexandrine Library. There is no Armenian in the text however.

I have also used Teseo's Armenian, Hebrew and Syriac manuscripts that are available in the University of Pavia's fine collection of manuscripts--open incidentally to the public from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., a schedule quite peculiar to that institution from my experience in Italy.

In Budapest, the Corviniana (in the Széchenyi National Library) has a fine collection of the extant works of Postel and I would suggest that anyone looking into that scholar do his research in the library's beautiful surroundings with the aid of its highly accomplished staff.

My personal concerns (teaching languages within a large institution) have led me to to the question how one learns a language and how one's errors arise and are maintained. The following is a fertile field for this investigation: especially in the matter of accurate information embedded in areas of evident mistakes and misunderstandings.

Are we justified to dismiss the entire corpus if we meet gross errors (Postel's personal knowledge of Turkey and the Middle East places him apart from our other scholars [he says that all the Armenians he met in Turkey used their language liturgically and used Turkish daily.]; he wrote many books on the pronunciation of Greek, Arabic and Hebrew and was fascinated by the topic of phonology; however, he makes the most egregious errors in transcription and he even describes the Coptic alphabet as proper to Georgia.)? Do we have the right to excuse or ignore peculiar lacunae in an author's knowledge if he has evident competence in the larger field, which leaves little explanation for the lapse: Teseo's table of the -թիւն declension is peculiar indeed : 175b-176a -ութայ, -ութիւ, -ութաբ, -ութենէ; only the last item has any resemblence (the ablative) to the Grabar declension in all the manuals; the others have lost the nasal entirely and seem to be indeterminedly used as nom., acc., or oblique within his texts. Could this be simply a bit of knowledge that he never acquired or is it the evidence for a dialect development that would occur if the accent shifted from the final syllable in polysyllabic forms (due to Persian influence in Tabriz?) and only the ablative form, where the nasal is protected by a final vowel, retains the nasals: all of this would suppose the original Tabrizi dialect had undergone stress shift and nasalization of the vowel in final syllables and then loss of that nasalization?

Finally, what do we do with someone who has the best working knowledge of the language, but has (through his informants and his purpose, the creation of a civil language (see Nichanian pp. 256-257)) mixed the registers and dialects: Rivola is roundly condemned by the Mechitarists and by Schroeder for his Turkicisms and his colloquial forms--պար for պանիր/մենք for մեք, but his grammar sustained a century-long missionary establishment (beginning in 1584) of the Propagation of the Faith in the Orient? (Bolognesi and Nichanian)

Introduction: The Significance and Impact of Ambrogio

Teseo Ambrogio, *Introductio in Chaldaicum linguam, Syriacam atque Armenicam et decem alias linguas, characterum differentium Alphabeta circiter quadraginta,et eorumdem*

invicem conformatio; mystica et chabalistica quamplurima scitu digna. Et descriptio ac simulachrum Phagoti Afrani. Teseo Ambrosio ex Comitbus Albonesii J. U. Doct. Papien. Canonico Regulari Lateranensi, ac Sancti Petri in Coelo Aureo Papiae Praeposito, Authore. MDXXXIX.

Guillaume Postel, *Linguarum duodecem characteribus differentium Alphabetum*, Paris, 1538.

My work will introduce the reader to nearly all of the printed Armenian material readily available to scholars during the late Renaissance (the 16th and early 17th centuries). It will also examine the manuscript sources for these publications and discuss the Renaissance vision of Armenia and the Armenian language in the light of the texts being presented to its academic Latinate audience.

The context within which these texts were studied was one that was strictly philosophical and theological. This will be given greater specification below, but the reader must realize that the Christian nature of the texts meant that the Armenians were naturally considered part of a larger Christian Oecumene and nothing very alien was found within these texts to raise alarm or extravagant curiosity. The alphabet was extremely interesting because of the universal belief given Kabbalism (in Platonic garb) during the entire period, and we will say much about this; however, the manuscript sources for the texts used were extremely limited and most of them were of Catholic Armenian provenance or were Armenian translations of well-known Greek classics. These latter would raise particular translation problems between the Greek originals and the traditional Latin translations, but almost all of this discussion was profoundly non-controversial.

In addition, the linguistic and grammatical categories used by all of the authors are derivative of those inaugurated by Aristotle and canonized by Priscian and Donatus (Collinge; Robins). Although all of our cited works would be influenced by Arabic and Hebrew philosophical grammatical theory, the effect is hidden by the older terminology (Collinge). Only the actual

translation of Armenian grammars based on Thrax (accomplished by Galanus) overtly made a new, old authority available to the Renaissance .

By the middle 17th century the great theological controversies would be raging as Catholic missionaries sought to save the world from Protestant and all other heresies. The earlier Renaissance was still one Christian World faced by a powerful enemy, renewed Ottoman Isalm, and Christian Brotherhood was the common academic stance.

Ambrogio's huge work of 400 pages and Postel's smaller work of some 80 are monuments to printing and to erudition: both contain extensive samples of some 40 different languages and their alphabets with extensive grammatical commentaries and complete Roman alphabet transcriptions. As storehouses of linguistic data they are unrivaled: they allow an aural and visual snapshot of the languages in question (those of the Orient and Africa) during their Medieval Periods.

These two works have been considered fascinating curiosities for more than four centuries: they have been delved into for linguistic examples, some of their plates have been reproduced for their beauty and exotic qualities, and they have been quoted for their background information given on the Oriental and African peoples whose languages were illustrated therein, but they have hardly been appreciated as their authors intended if they have not been made available as complete works.

There is a moral thread that runs throughout both works and that thread can only be discerned with the entire works in hand: humankind is one in origin, thought, belief and behavior. Both these men were profoundly religious and humanistic, and both these men suffered for their beliefs throughout their lives. Postel recorded that life of suffering in a vast series of works and tracts; Ambrogio saw most of his work destroyed through the ravages of war and his only published book is the one in question.

These texts are awe-inspiring to read for the labor and learning displayed, but they have many practical scholarly potentialities, which can only be realized if they are extensively annotated

and given a modern critical apparatus. They are repositories of the pronunciation of the languages described during their time: we cannot know how a language was pronounced unless we find a consistent spelling error in a native-speaker's writing or we find a name or word of the language reproduced in another language's writing system. Within these works we have numerous opportunities to hear languages and dialects that we could never have heard otherwise.

More important, these compilations are the most extensive and definitive expositions of the Renaissance philosophical theories of national and linguistic relationships: only by reading the entirety of these works can we understand the particulars of past hypotheses of mankind's interconnectedness: an issue of profound importance for our present attempts to answer similar questions and to use those answers to develop realistic policies.

The scholars who might refer to this work are legion: philosophers, comparative Semiticists, Indo-Europeanists, Caucasists, etc; historical linguists of all stripes, historians of ideas: religious, scientific, political, orientalist, etc., and all of the philologists and textual scholars working in the languages described.

Part I: A Philosophical Prolegomenon:

Teseo Ambrogio degli Albonesi's work requires for its understanding a great deal of world-view reorientation on the part of the uninitiated reader. The reader unfamiliar with Renaissance Latin Academic writings is plunged into a sea of petty and confusing references couched in the most nuanced Latin imaginable. In Ambrogio's case the confusion is even more abrupt due to the presence of almost uninterrupted citations from Greek, Syriac, Hebrew, Ethiopic (Ge'ez), Chaldaean, Coptic, Arabic, Vandalic, Macedonian, Dalmatian, Armenian, etc. religious texts in the original alphabets so that the eye/mind must read in multiple directions as it scans a page.

It is my intention to provide a detailed map of the territory for the reader interested in the large amount of Armenian contained in the text. However, it is essential that we first give a general

introduction to the goals that Ambrogio sought to reach in his one and only published book (written, printed and published almost entirely through his own efforts).

The life-long goal of Ambrogio's was the publication of a proper Syriac Psalter. This goal was never realized, but the *Introductio...* represents a sort of introduction to the entire project: almost 80% of its citations are from the Psalms, in whatever language, and almost all of the philological discussions center around textual dissention among the various translations of the Songs of King David. The other goal of the *Introductio....* is the detailed exploration of the relationships between the World's known alphabets (not languages as we think of them). All of this is in the context of Eternity and there is no diachronic analysis as such attempted. Manuscripts written and copied in various situations and times are all treated as one synchronic source for the facts of the language; nonetheless, all of the conflicting evidence is duly noted so that this odd testimonial becomes a primary source for historical investigation.

Ambrogio believed in and practiced a common version of the Perennial Philosophy that provided the intellectual environment for scholarship from Petrarch and Pico della Mirandola to Newton, Grotius and Leibnitz: this vision accepted as unquestionable the divine authorship of scripture; the reality of miracles; the importance of prayer, astrology, numerology, alchemy, kabbalism, and prophecy as relevant technologies for the interpretation of the higher reality adumbrated by our lower one, the world and all in it; the existence of angels, demons, jinn, gnomes, etc. and their abilities to intrude upon our World; the need for a scholar to be familiar with all of the works that describe these interrelationships; the primacy of three languages, Latin, Greek and Hebrew (although Latin could be replaced by Armenian, Arabic, Coptic or Syriac depending upon the confession of the individual [see Wakefield]); the spiritual primacy in human nature, and the need for accurate interpretation due to the fact that falsity can only enter this realm through the physically clouded state of human understanding.

This is a very long list, but quite a few of us today, who consider ourselves rational scientific beings, continue to hold to a majority of the points above. This philosophical orientation was a point of agreement among Jews, Christians, Muslims, Buddhists and Hindus, but the first three enjoyed a special relationship as they agreed upon a common intellectual library that

illuminated their exploration of this manifold: the Bible and the Greeks. When we read Ambrogio with these points in mind, our sympathies for his odd collocations and weird argumentation must increase.

For, he is still approaching language and thought through Aristotelian categories. He has, however, new tools provided by the Arab and Hebrews scholars (influenced thereby from Indian studies), (Collinge; Ramat) and he is attempting to coordinate this seemingly conflicting collection without any wilingness to question or reconsider the bedrock convictions, which we have listed.

The Renaissance was never of time of Philosophical innovation; it was a period of consolidation within philosophy. The upheavals in Byzantium and the Orient brought to the West a broader palette of the familiar philosophers (Aristotle and Plato largely) as well as important critical translations of older texts in languages new to Europeans (Armenian, Arabic, Syriac, etc.). This wealth spread throughout the intellectual community due to the recent invention of printing so that the impact became thorough going. This confirmation of the universality of the Medieval philosophical tradition posed a challenge to Europeans awakening to their own power to compare and critique a wide spectrum of texts. It was this closure of the Medieval view point which we recognize in Ambrogio and Postel. The critique would come in the next century with the dawning of the Age of Reason and Scientific Experimentation, when a more particularly European voice and vision would be handed on to the Enlightenment (Grafton; Gehl a.).

In addition to this, Ambrogio's Faith (Christianity of the Roman Catholic variety) was equally unquestioned. He died during the dawning of the fragmentation of Western Christendom, yet his entire professional work (Papal investigator into the Eastern Churches' Orthodoxy) was predicated on the ecumenical union of all Christian Churches, especially those under threat from militant Ottoman Islam. He ironically possessed a surprising variety of Armenian confessional writings: probably a Chalcedonian Orthodox Psalter, two Armenian Catholic liturgical manuscripts and Apostolic collections of the Church Fathers (writing on Christology and the Trinity), yet none of his commentary mentions any of the inherent conflicts that these

texts might contain. His 'secular' works were translations from the Greek of Porphyry, Aristotle, Euclid and Philo, but our concept of the Perennial Philosophy denies any system of thought the designation secular: everything is in the Divine domain and everything must have something to say about the Divinity (in Ambrogio's case something to say about a Divinity seen from a distinctly 'Catholic' point of view).

Guillaume Postel (16th century) would take all of these realities most deeply to heart as a Jesuit and missionary to the East: he dreamed of arguing the Muslims to Christianity using the Koran! But, the times would change and our later authors would live in a fragmented Christianity, where sympathy and tolerance were treated as heresy and treason.

Rivola (17th century), a missionary to the Armenians from the Propaganda Fide, was a warrior in the Catholic fight to save the souls in the East from their own errors and the errors of the Protestants. The breadth of vision had narrowed enormously in the century after Ambrogio's death, and his works were serving different ends because of different realities. Yet, again, it would not be a commonplace for such a man to have realized the change in circumstance or vision; he would have argued that the change was entirely on the part of the heretics. Nonetheless, there is a mighty consistency to his thinking and his predecessors' and I will argue below that this extends far back in time and space (farther than they might have been able to imagine).

We, who are living in the aftermath of this intellectual revolution, the Enlightenment and 19th Century Materialism, which raised History and Change to the hierarchical summit, must work hard to appreciate the wonderful intelligence and cohesion of Ambrogio's Renaissance visions of Platonic serenity. It can be done, and we have among us those who continue to view the world with Renaissance eyes (all such are considered cranks, but invited to Talk Shows and certain to sell blockbuster novels or autobiographies). During the research and thinking for this book, I have discovered three prime examples of the Ambrogian mind-set: one book is *The Word* , written by an Israeli who derives modern English from Hebrew, another is *The Bible, the Quran, and Science* written by a French doctor, who claims to reconcile science with religion, and, finally, there is an obscure paper that I found in an Armenian academic biology

journal, in which the author attempts to show that biochemistry and physics accord with the 38 letters of the divinely granted Armenian alphabet. (Mozeson; Bucaille; Poghosyan)

Far from laughing at any of these studies, my time with Ambrogio has shown me why great minds can consider reality in these, to us, odd ways. Newton, himself, or Leibnitz would have found great cogency in all of the above authors' argumentation. To have such defenders is a great honor, which we should never trivialize.

The following pages are an exploration of this philosophical territory. Yet, this book brings something else into play. I have carefully culled all of the Armenian material found in Ambrogio and given, if possible, its manuscript origins. The less philosophically inclined will find much in the work to intrigue their imaginations. Whether the reader is a philologist or historian of philosophical thought, I hope that he or she responds to my work and Ambrogio's with sympathy and an open heart.

Part II: The Significance of Teseo Ambrogio's Alphabetical Compendium (1539) and Guillaume Postel's Far-Shorter and Derivative Work (1538) for Philosophy, Middle Eastern Studies, Linguistics, Religious Studies, and the History of Ideas.

Ambrogio's and Postel's books are visually some of the most impressive monuments to early printing: the creation of over 25 fonts alone is a feat of artistic and scholastic note. As you can see from the tables of contents included below, the ethnic, linguistic and historical compass is breath-taking.

In an age worried about correcting multicultural misunderstanding and misinformation, these works from the Renaissance remind us that the world of the civilized and the scholarly has always been a multicultural one and that printing very early on attempted to slake that very human thirst for the exotic and the unknown.

Part III: The Contents of Teseo Ambrogio's Book:

The book's pagination is by folio so that the page numbers are given by folio number recto/verso. The total number of folios is 215 so that there are 430 pages.

The following is a translation of Ambrogio's Index Capitulorum, found on Folio 8:

The Vandalic alphabet is variously illustrated on the following folios: 50, 51, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, 77, 149, 150, 158, 163, 166, 167, 170, 171, and 174.

Folios 184-192: Chaldean and Armenian textual examples.

Folios 193-215: Miscellaneous appendices: 24 different alphabets, a description of Arabic grammar, and descriptions of magical writing.

The following is Ambrogio's summary of the alphabets discussed (Folio 1):

The names of the languages and alphabets illustrated in this work:

Chaldean	Dalmatian
Samaritan	Illyrian
Assyrian	Indian (Ethiopic: Mayerson)
Syriac	Armenian
Phoenician	Vandalic
Hebrew	A Cipher of Apollonius of Tyana
Arabic	A Cipher of Virgil (the Magus)
Punic	Hieroglyphs
Persian	Babylonian
Tartar	Eritrean
Turkish	Saracen
Latin	Egyptian
Greek	Etruscan
Jacobite	Gothic
Coptic	Hibernian (Irish)
Macedonian	Georgian
Missian	Unknown
Bulgarian	Characters given a Spolentan magician
Serbian	
Russian	

Teseo Ambrogio's book (430 closely printed pages) is a vast mine of information that has hardly been plumbed. Most of the reference books mention it for its description of the

Phagotus (an early oboe) and this four page entry in a book of over four hundred pages is the most common notice that the book receives.

Specialists in Armenology and Syriac Studies know it as one of the earliest examples of printed Armenian and Syriac outside of the confessional groups themselves, but due to the many seemingly erroneous readings (especially in the Armenian), these specialists have considered it a curiousity worthy of little more than mention (the dialect study of Armenian and the confessional tongues of Syriac or Coptic have long collected native scribes' errors for evidence of differing pronunciations, etc., but the mistakes of former scholars have usually been treated with disdain).

My comparisons of Ambrogio's printed texts and his manuscripts has shown that most of the errors did not originate with Ambrogio: he is a faithful copyist of whatever he found within the manuscripts that came into his possession and there is equal reason to believe that (excluding the influence of his kabbalistic theories that give superordinate weight to the written letter rather than to the sound) he was as scrupulous when transcribing his informants' renditions of those texts.

Historians of Renaissance Orientalism and Linguistics have had greater reason to cull this particular source, but there has been little done with the actual materials collected there except as examples of the Biblically based linguistic theories of the author.

Part IV: Postel's Table of Contents:

Guillaume Postel, *Linguarum duodecem characteribus differentium Alphabetum*, Paris, 1538.
: (There is no pagination, but the book has only 75 pages)
Hebrew
Chaldean (Aramaic)
Modern Chaldean (Syriac)
Samaritan, which is the original Hebrew according to Postel)
Arabic or the Punic (with a compendious grammar)

Indic (as Ethiopic was known in the Middle Ages: Mayerson)

Greek

Georgian (a gross error as the texts are Coptic)

Serbian

Illyrian or Dalmatian

Armenian

Latin

Guillaume Postel's book had a far greater print run and being only some 80 pages in length has far fewer examples of texts, but it is especially valuable when read with Ambrogio's work because he lifted most of the examples of languages that he was not falmiliar with directly from his friend and mentor, Ambrogio, while acquiring their pronunciations on his own, and with those languages for which he had the greater experience: Arabic, Greek and Turkish, his materials prove a cautionary and explanatory addition to the texts which Ambrogio did include.

A comment by Vrej Nersessian upon a later French publication of an Armenian alphabet and Hayr Mer, Pierre Victor Cayet, *Paradigmata de quatuor linguis orientalibus praecipuiis, Arabica, Armena, Syra* [sic]*, Aethiopica* (1569), clearly shows the influence of Postel's and by derivation, AmbrogioTeseo's, works on later Western printed exempla of that language. Nersessian writes, 'The Armenian text of the Lord's prayer (pp. 79-80), followed with a transliteration and Latin translation... [has] several misprints in the text of the prayer, such as '*or yerkins des* [es]; *elic'i* [elic'in]' which are also repeated in the Latin transcription and in all subsequent publications using this text.' (Nercessian 1980 p. 37) As we shall see, this version of the Lord's prayer derives from Pavia MS 347, a Kaffa Catholic Armenian Lectionary, used by Ambrogio for his printed text (the words of which he misdivided; it should read, *or yerkinsd es*) and then presented as a woodblock print in Postel whence they came to Cayet and from Ambrogio directly to Rivola (1624), who provided a specious grammatical explanation.

Part V: Conclusions

When I first examined the book four years ago at the Newberry Library in Chicago, I was most excited by the presence of a full roman-alphabet transcription for all of the citations in the original alphabets. As a linguist, it was as if I had found a 460 year old informant, for there is little hard information about a language's actual pronunciation at a certain time if it retains the same writing system for millenia: the orthography of the English word 'love' or 'debt' has little to say about its present, Shakespearean or dialectal pronunciations, but if I search in ships' logs from the Seventeenth century and find spellings like 'luff,' 'luv,' 'det,' or 'dit,' then I can feel fairly sure what the comtemporary speller was speaking to me with a more phonetic voice.

Ambrogio's book has given scholarship the phonetic notes of a Sixteenth century scholar, who had a wide acquaintanceship with the contemporary travellers from the East, and one who had, with his friend Guillaume Postel, quite a fascination with the sound of the languages that he was studying.

I needed to know who his informants were, where they came from and what manuscript traditions they offered him. These have been the questions that I have been investigating in the Armenian sphere, and all the methodologies that I have developed there are easily transferable to the other languages contained in his work.

I persuaded the Armenian Chair at UCLA to acquire microfilms of Ambrogio's and Postel's works for the library and as soon as these arrived, I had hard-copies made. I have examined the copies that exist in a number of libraries: the Marciana in Venice, the Manuscriptorium in Yerevan, and the Library of the Armenian Monastery on San Lazzaro in Venice.   I have collated the variations (some of the scripts were not fonted, but added by hand), and I have collected most of the marginal annotations.

I have discovered the remnants of Ambrogio's library in Pavia and have compared his printed Armenian texts with his Armenian manuscripts; I have also discovered his handwritten interlinears and annotations: these too should be included in a greater variorum text for the best use of his linguistic data. At the Vatican Library and Venice's Marciana, I have largely

collected the references to Ambrogio in biographical, historical, linguistic and religious works from his time until the present: I would have liked to have worked in Milan's Ambrosiana, but it has been closed for remodelling.

The languages that Ambrogio and Postel heard from their various informants were not those that present scholars recreate for the delectation of their students: our present pronunciational traditions were not yet completed and the informants were not necessarily privy to the traditions created by their own specialists: these were probably merchants as often as they were highly educated clerics; thus, the breadth of their dialectal variation might be greater than a modern scholar would obtain by going to his well-known sources.

If we can fix the territorial origin of these informants we can add to the dialect maps of these languages during the 16th century. We would be writing mini-grammars of the language presented to Ambrogio and Postel and noting the areas where it deviated most from the received canon. If manuscript mistakes (mis-readings and spellings) could not explain the facts, we might suppose that dialect differences were at work.

It is best to illustrate the pronunciational uncertainty that an Armenian text is heir too. The following is the ever popular and very often to be referred to 'Pater Noster' (Hayr Mer); I have transcribed the text using the Meillet system, followed that with a Western (1) dialect phonemic representation, followed by an Eastern (2) dialect phonemic representation, followed by a word for word translation into English. The text is that referred to by Nercessian above and found in numerous books of exempla of curious Christian language lore.   The questionable readings are in bold print and the pronunciation maintains the received text's wording and inflectional forms. It originates in Ambrogio's MS 347 (14th century) and it reappears throughout the 16th and 17th centuries in almost all of the nations of Europe:

Hayr mer or yerkins **des** surb elič̣i anun
1 Hayr mer vor herginas tes surp yeič̣i anu
2 Hayr mer vor herkinas des surb yeič̣i anu
 Father our who in heaven thou art holy be name
ko. ekesč̄ ark̇ayufai k̇o elič̇in kamk̇ k̇o
 1 ko. yegesœ ark̇ayura ka, yeičin gamk k
 2 ko. yekesč̇e ark̇ayuča k̇o, yeičin kamk̇ k
 thy.   Come kingdom thy,   be will(s) thy

orp̄ēs yerkins ew ierkri. zhać mer **hanap-**
1 vorbes herginəs yev hergri. əzhac mer hanab-
2 vorpes herkinəs yev herkri. əzhac mer hanap-
   As   on heavens and earth. Bread our dai-

čord tur mez aysawr ew tol mez **zpaar-**
1 zort dur mez aysōr yev toy mez əzbaa
2 zord tur mez aysōr yev foy mez əzpaa
   ly   give us   today   and allow us   ow-

tis mer orp̄ēs ew mek̄ fohunk̄ meroc̄ **part-**
1 dis mer vorbes yev mek toyumk meroc bard
2 tis mer vorpes yev mek̄ fonunk̄ meroć part
   ings our   as   we   allow   to us ow-

panać ew mi tanir zmez i p̄orjufai ayl
1 banac yev mi danir əzmez i porcuta ayl
2 panać yev mi tanir əzmez i p̄orjufa ayl
   ers   and do not lead us into temptations but

p̄rkeay zmez i čarē. zi k̄o ē arkayufai
1 pergya əzmez i čare. zi ko e arkayuta
2 p̄erkya əzmez i čare. zi k̄o e arkayufa
free   us   from evil. For thine is kingdom

ew **zawrufai** ew p̄ark̄ yawiteana **Amen.**
1 yev zōruta yev park havidyanəs. amen.
2 yev zōrufa yev park̄ havityanəs amen.
   and   power and glory   forever.   Amen.

Chapter I: The Armenian Material in Teseo Ambrogio's Alphabetical Compendium

Part I: Philological Introduction

This chapter will provide a philological description of the various Armenian citations contained within Teseo's *Introductio in Chaldaicum linguam, Syriacam atque Armenicam st decem alias linguas, characterum differentium Alphabeta circiter quadraginta,et eorumdem invicem conformatio; mystica et chabalistica quamplurima scitu digna. Et descriptio ac simulachrum Phagoti Afrani.* It will be suggested that this might be used as a source for the reconstruction of the pronunciation of the 16th century Armenian dialect of Tabriz.

The issues considered here are Ambrogio's overall intentions, his transcription of Oriental alphabets and its phonological basis (if any), his Armenian informant's/s' education and status, the texts used by his informants (which might explain deviations from his general

practice), Ambrogio's prejudices that might have colored his interpretation of their information, and whether his prejudices might be turned to good use.

Of 432 total pages (paginated by leaves so that I will refer to 2a and 2b), Ambrogio dedicates approximately one-quarter to Armenian. He tells us something of Armenia's history, biblical and classical, and then recounts the trials of his chief informant, John, a noble Amenian of Tabriz.   John had been enslaved following the city's capture by the Turks and had been finally ransomed by Catholic monks. He had moved to Rome, where he was received by Pope Paul III some time after 1534 and probably had gone from there to Venice, where he had met Ambrogio. (Richard, 170-177; Ambrogio 143a)   Tabriz had been the main center of Uniate activity in the Eastern dialect speaking regions of the Armenian world; moreover, the dialect evidence that John gives Ambrogio predates the forced resettlement of the Armenians of the Julfa and the Ararat Valley within the boundaries of Persia during the reign of Shah Abbas, in the early 17th century.

Venice was one of the European centers for the Armenian merchant communities and had been so for many years as attested by the Armenian graffiti still prominent upon St. Mark's pillars and pilasters.   It was also a perfect venue for a student of the Orient's many tongues. Ambrogio knew other Armenians than John, and they were speakers of the Western dialects, for Ambrogio speculates dizzily on the bizarre variations in the phonetic values placed on the same Armenian letter of the alphabet. Nevertheless, Ambrogio's transcription is based upon the pronunciation of the East, not the West. While this could have been derived from a long held tradition of a Golden Age pronunciation, it seems more likely that an Eastern informant is the root cause, and the best candidate for that informant is John of Tabriz. (Ambrogio 144ab-145ab; Ep'rikean 1901)

One very peculiar idee fixe of Ambrogio's is the proper pronunciation of the Tsade (note that this is the only letter not included in the normal order of the Greek Alphabet derived from the Phonecian and only appears as a counting letter at the end [Gamkrelidze]) in all of its Semetic manifestations: he hears it as a fricative rather than an affricate and this insistance will color his discussion of the Armenian affricates. He does not separate the letter from the sound (being

strongly influenced by cabalistic notions), but he does speak of these letters' sounds in surprisingly Trubetzkoyan language. He also has some illuminating comments to make on the genetic relations between the letters of the different alphabets: he adumbrates Marquart's connection of certain Armenian and Coptic letters. (Ambrogio 17b-18a; Marquart 40-48; Peeters; Russell)

Part II: Ambrogio's Transcription:

His transcription is fairly phonetic and straight-forward until one gets to the numerous affricates and fricatives of Armenian. '**2**' for instance is transcribed as both `s' and `sc.' The latter transcription is close to the modern phonetic value if we consider that it comes from the Italian pronunciation of this digraph, yet what was its pronunciation in the 16th century? If 's' is rare, does it represent a typesetter's error?

Ambrogio does not confine himself to a purely Italianate transcription: it must be remembered that it had not been that long ago that Marco Polo had chosen to produce his work in the universally understood French rather than the more obscure Italian. In Venetian territory Frankish, and even Catalan, orthographies were still influential (Devoto): Ambrogio uses `que' and `x' to denote /k/ and /ʃ/ respectively, yet he also uses the last to represent '**ď**' , and thus is including /ʒ/. In the matter of diachronic pronunciation, there is no certitude that the affricates of Medieval French had simplified by this period, and the same sounds are equally dubious in northern Italian dialects. Yet these are the sounds that concern Ambrogio the most.

There are many cases when Ambrogio seems simply to be transliterating in the crudest sense, yet his textual discussions are constantly referring to written and by implication pronunciational variants: on 153b he notices both **q.ptq** and **pq.ptq**.

He has obviously sufficient information to do more than mechanically transliterate. Ambrogio frequently doubles his `h's when the received text had only one: especially in **wՀw**. Normally, he uses `hh' for **ʰ**, so this usage conflicts with the systemization of his transcription. Babken Choogaszyan remembers his first encounter with Acharyan. He was

editing a text when Acharyan entered the room and asked him where so and so might be; when he answered the simple inquiry, Acharyan immediately declared that he spoke the Tabrizi dialect. He identified it by the overlong pronunciation of consonants. Thus this doubling (an effect an Italian would have a natural ear for) may be a mark of Ambrogio's aural acuity rather than any carelessness.

If his Ե is transcribed /je/ and his Է, /æ/, are these more than algebraic? Can they display the pronunciation of Tabriz? When Ambrogio transliterates ՈՐ, /or/, is he mindlessly following the text, or is this his informant's pronunciation as it is today frequently in the dialects of Mush, Xaberd, Partizak, Sebastia, and Hamshen (Greppin)?

Here follows Ambrogio's transcription of the Armenian letters with his inclusion of the various pronunciations he was familiar with and a few comments on typesetters errors and more profound errors of Ambrogio himself.

Ambrogio considers the following letters vowels although he is giving the word a different meaning from that we would today: Ա, Ե, Է, Ը, Ի, Ւ, Հ, Ձ, Յ, Ո, Ւ, Ւ, Ու, Օ. He divides these into simple vowels and diphthongs. To make the diphthongs he designates, Ա, Ե, Ի, Ո, as radicals and, Յ, Ւ, Ւ, as helpers. There is much in this list that would seem dubious to modern linguistics. It must be remembered that Ambrogio is using the Semetic alphabets as the universal template for all subsequent ones and his designations have as much to do with his historical theories as anything else. (Ambrogio 17ab, 144ab)

The consonants are Բ, Գ, Դ, Զ, Թ, Ժ, Լ, Ծ, Կ, Ձ, Մ, Ն, Չ, Շ, Պ, Ջ, Ռ, Ս, Ր, Ց, Փ, Ք, Ֆ. He divides them into the simple, the double, and the aspirated. (Ambrogio 145ab)

The letters are also given a transcription and a phonetic evaluation. The latter gives both Western and Eastern pronunciation, but the Eastern form is consistently used to transcribe the texts he quotes. I will give two examples of such texts with a short commentary after giving the various values he ascribes to the Armenian letters.

These are the sounds he has heard connected with the letters: ա (ayp/a) բ (byen, pyen/b, p) գ (giem, chiem/g, c) դ (da, ta/d, t) ե (iech/e, ie) զ (za/z) է (ae,e) ը (iet/ie) թ (tho/th) ժ (ge, ze, xe/g, z, x) ի (ini/i) լ (luen/l) խ (hhe/hh) ծ (dha, tza, zza/dh, tz, zz) կ (chien, gien, kien, quien/c, g, k, q) հ (ho/h) ձ (ssa, tsa, zza/ss, ts, zz) ղ (glal, gal/gl, l) ճ (ie, gie, hie/i, g, h) մ (miem/m) յ (i/i) ն (nu/n) շ (sa, scha/s, sc) ո (vua/o) չ (secha, zia/s, z) պ (pe, be/p, b) ջ (sche, zche/sc, ch, q, z) ռ (rha, rra/rh, rr) ս (se/s) վ (viech, vieu, vieph/u [v]) տ (tuen, duen/t, d) ր (re/r) ց (zzo/zt, zz) ւ (yun, phyun/ y [ypsilon]) փ (puir, psiur/p, ps) ք (che/ch) և (ieu/eu) ֆ (phe/ph) օ (aypyun/o). The transcription of the affricates is very poor and many sound values are based upon the Greek originals rather than the Armenian as with ps and ph. (Ambrogio 143ab; see discussion below)

Ambrogio transcribes the Introit for the Mass for St. Ambrose on page 152b: Ած (Astuzt/Deus) որ (or/qui) ժողովրդեան (zoglÒrdean/populo) քում (chum/tuo) յաւիտենական (iauitenacan/aeterne) փրկութե~ (phercuthene [sic]/salutis) զերանելին (zeranelin/beatum) Ամբրոսիուî (Ambrosios/Ambrosium) սպասաւոր (spasauor/ministrum) Հատուցեր (hatuzter/tribuisti) պարգևեա (pargeuea/praesta) աղաչեմք (aglazemch/quaesumus) զի (zi/ut) զոր (zor/quem) վարդապետ (vardapet/doctorem) կենաց (cenazt/vitae) ունեաք(vneach/habuimus) ի (i/in [sic]) յերկրի (iercri/terris). Բարեխոս (barehhos/intercessore) ունել (vnel/habere) արժանասցուք (arxanaszzuch/mereamur) ի (i/in [sic]) յերկինս (iercins/coelis). (Ambrogio 152b)

The passage is transcribed in the Eastern Dialect although there are no hints at the proper placement of `schwas' in the cases of consonant clusters.  It is somewhere between a phonetic transcription and a transliteration (based on the prevailing Armenian orthography).   A commentary on the passage should first note that the redundant `i' for the initial `y' of the word heaven is the enclitic `i' (in). The auditor could have been puzzled by the yodizatiion of the initial `e' in Armenian (perhaps that feature of the modern language had not yet  been generalized) or the yodization may not have been present in the Tabrizi dialect and the different pronunciations of different informants  may have simply confused the issue.  Note also the mistake with the abbreviation of `t'iwn' (thene).   Ambrogio makes repeated errors with

abbreviations as will become evident with his transcription of the `Lord's Prayer.' It should also be noted that ancient digraph `aw' is here replaced with the long `o' (barehhos) as it is today while it is used in the following passage.

Հայր (Hair/Pater) մեր (mer/noster) որ (or/qui) յերկինս (iercins/in coelis) դես (des/es [sic]) սուրբ (surb/sanctum) եղիցի (eglizzi/sit) անուն (anun/nomen) քո (cho/tuum). եկեսցէ (eceszze/veniat) արքայութաի (archaiuthai [sic]/regnum) քո (cho/tuum) եղիցին (eglizzin/fiant) կամք (camch/placita) քո (cho/tua) որպէս (orpes/sicut) յերկինս (iercins/in coelo) և (eu/et) իերկրի (iercri [sic]/in terra). զՀաց (Zhazt/Panem) մեր (mer/nostrum) Հանապաչորդ (hanapazord [sic] /suprasubstatialem) տուր (tur/da) մեզ (mez/nobis) այսաւր (aisaur [!] աւ for օ/hodie) և (eu/et) թող (thogl/remitte) մեզ (mez/nobis) զպարտիս (zpaartis [sic]/debita) մեր (mer/nostra) որպէս (orpaes/sicut) և (eu/et) մէք (mech/nos) թողումք (thoglumch/remittimus) մերոց (merozt/nostris) պարտպանաց (partpanazt [sic]/debitoribus) և (eu/et) մի (mi/ne) տանիր (tanir/ducas) զմեզ (zmez/nos) ի (i/in) փորձութաի (phorxuthai [sic]/tentationem) այլ (ail/sed) փրկեայ (pharceai [sic]/libera) զմեզ (zmez/nos) ի (i/a) չարէ (zarae/malo). զի (zi/quem) քո (cho/tuum) է (ae/est) արքայութաի (archaiuthai [sic]/regnum) և (eu/et) զաւրութաի (zauruthai [!] [sic]/virtus) և (eu/et) փառք (pharhch/gloria) յաւիտեանս (iauiteans/insecula). Ամէն (amen [sic]/amen). (Ambrogio 185b)

This prayer has many interesting errors. `Amen' is spelled without the `long e' and an extra `y' is added to `pharceai' and 'a' represents schwa. There are the repeated mistakes made in interpretation of the Armenian abbreviations. Is it possible that these abbreviations were read in a special way as we might today say `ay ii' for i.e.? There are many simple typos: չ written for զ (but Ambrogio makes no phonetic distinction between them), the doubling of `a', and the writing of ի for յ.

The most astounding error is the form `des' for `you are'. The possibility that this is a simple error is small considering that the inclusion of the verb `to be' here would be a natural error for speakers of the everyday language and why would a foreigner learning the language from

accomplished teachers create such a nonce form? One possibility is that `des' is the verb with an enclitic `du'; such developments are common in the IE languages (see Germanic `ist [is + dental of the 2nd person singular], bist, art, etc.)  This could be a dialectal feature due to the speaker's hypercorrection of the Grabar text, which is missing the auxilary because the Greek text is without one.  There is also the possibility that the `d' of 'des' was actually the enclitic possessive attached to the previous noun, and it has been written as part of the verb `to be' (`es') because of the normally enclitic pronunciation of that verb itself. (Ajamian; Weitenberg) Nonetheless, the form is a strange one.

I have already talked about the use of `aw' rather than `long o', which is an archaic feature. We should also note that Ambrogio chooses to differentiate the `long e' in two ways: e and ae.

Part III: His Armenian Informants:

As already mentioned, Ambrogio writes of only one specific teacher of Armenian: John of Tabriz. Yet one can plainly see the traces of others in his sections on the pronunciational variants of names, not to mention the orthographical disparaties he detects.

This John was especially mentioned as he recounts the recent history of a very important Catholic outpost in the East, Tabriz, and because his own history is so pitiable (Richard). It is also possible that John was an especial friend of Ambrogio's old age.

Tabriz had been recently ravaged by the Turks in John's account and John had been ransomed from captivity by the Dominicans. In 1514, the city had been taken by Selim, but it had been attacked again by Suleiman in 1534. The later date is also the beginnings of Ambrogio's Armenian font, which was created in Ferrara and added to his other fonts that had been saved from the sacking of Pavia. (Fumagelli)

Here is the original Latin text and the translation of Ambrogio's Introduction to the Armenian language found in the *Introductio...* Folio 142:

De Armeniorum literis, & introductione. Cap. XIII

Armeniam, Asiae Provinciam, inter Taurum & Caucasum Montes sitam esse, ne dum omnibus qui in literaria Ethnicorum versantur Palestra, verum etiam his qui sacrae novi & veteris instrumenti scripturae volumina legunt, notum esse credimus. Quippe (ut Ptolomeum, Solinum, Dionysium, Stephanum, Virgilium, Lucanum, & multos alios autores praetermittamus) in libro Geneseos, cap. 8. scriptum habemus. Requieuitque Arca mense septimo, vigesima septima die mensis super Montes Armeniae, & in quarto Regum. 19. Et reversus est Senacherib, Rex Asyriorum, & mansit in Ninive, cumque adoraret in templo Nesrach, deum suum Adramelech, & Sarasat filii eius persusserunt eum gladio, fugeruntque in terram Armeniorum, & regnavit Assaradon, filius eius pro eo. Hanc terram Hebraica litera אֶרֶץ אֲרָרָט aerez ararat, id est terram ararat appellat. Et nos quoque in libro Esaiae prophetae, cap. 37. Terram ararat habemus, & quod in dicto capitulo octavo Geneseos Hebraica literea hêt עַל הָרֵי אֲרָרָט Gal hare ararat, super montes ararat. ibi Arabicus textus sic habet *ldfi · §ᵐ Âŵi* Alai gbal pharda. super montes pharda. In Tigris fluvius est, & Araxes, de quo Lucanus libro sexto. Armeniumque bibit Romanus Araxem. Dividitur autem Regio haec in maiorem & minorem Armeniam, ut idem Poeta Lucanus innuit dicens. Nec tu populos utraque vagantes Armenia Ἀρμενία χώρα πλήσιον τῶν περσῶν, Armenia (inquit Stephanus) Regio est proxima Persis. Obediunt enim parentque Armeni in temporalibus Persarum Regi, qui vulgo dicit, el Sophi. In spiritualibus vero illis praeest Simas Patriarcha, qui Praesbytero Ioanni Indorum Pontifici, obedientiam praestat. Sunt autem Armeni Christiani sancti Thomae, de la cintura, vulgo appellati, & iuxta Romanae Ecclesiae ritum se degere asserunt. Troisam magnam Armeniae Civitatem, proximis annis Othomanus Turcarum Imperator, vi coepit, captamque ferro & igne consumptam destruxit, & Christianos omnes utriusque sexus ab annis quadraginta supra, tanquam pecora immaniter trucidavit, & ab indem citra captivos universos duxit, partemque eorum sub hasta vendidit: partem vero captivam adhuc pollicita redemptionis mercede ligatam retinet. Testatur hoc nobilis Troisae Civis Ioannes, & qui cum illo in Italiam pro captivis redimendis, paulo ante advecti adsummi Pontificis Pauli se pedes humiliter prostraverunt, et stipem per Ecclesias. & Urbium Plateas suppliciter exposcunt. Illorum triginta & novem esse elementa literarumque figuras, in superioribus cum de vocalibus loqueremur asservimus, & quoties de consonantibus armenicis verba facere contigit, ad armenicam introductionem lectorem remissimus. Proinde

necessarium fore visum fuit, ut rursus ab alphabeti ordine inciperemus. Sunt igitur armeniorum literae, & eorum nomina infrascripta.

Translation:

'Chapter XIII: Concerning the Armenian Letters and an Introduction

We believe that it has been observed not only by all those engaged in the literary Palestra (arena) of nations, but truly besides this by those well read in the volumes of the sacred documents of the New and Old Testaments that Armenia is a Province of Asia situated between the Taurus and Caucasus Mountains. Of course, (passing over Ptolemy, Solinus, Dionysius, Stephanus, Virgil, Lucan, and many other authors) we find the following written in Genesis 8: 'And the ark came to rest upon the Armenian Mountains on the 27th day of the seventh month,' and in 4 Kings (2 Kings) 19: 'And Senacherib, the Assyrian King, returned and remained in Niniveh; and while worshipping in the temple of his god, Nesrach, his sons, Adramelech and Sarasar, struck him with swords and fled into the land of the Armenians; and his other son, Assaradon ruled in his stead.' The Hebrew letterrs name this land ארץ אררט aerez ararat, that is the land of Ararat. And we find in the Prophet Isaiah 37: 'the land of Ararat,' and it is said in Genesis 8 (that is the Hebrew letter 'Heth') על הרי אררט Gal hare ararat, upon the Mountains of Ararat, while the Arabic text has it so *ĺdfî · ʃ⁣ᵀᴹ Âæi* Alai gbal pharda, upon the Mountains of Farda. From these flow the rivers Tigris and Araxes, about which the poet Lucan says in his Sixth Book: 'And the Romans drank from Armenian Araxes.' Moreover, the region is divided into Greater and Lesser Armenia, which fact is also mentioned by Lucan in an aside, 'Nor you people wandering in both Armenias.' **'Αρμενία χώρα πλήσιον τῶν περσῶν**, Stephanus reports that Armenia borders Persia. The Armenians are presently obedient to the Persian King, commonly termed, el Sophi, as they are his subjects. In their spiritual life, they are presided over by Patriarch Simas, who renders obedience in turn to the Indian Pontif, Prester John. Besides these, there are Armenian Christians of St. Thomas, who are known in the vulgar tongue as 'de la cintura (of the cincture),' and they have placed themselves in union with the Roman Church's Rite. Tabriz is the major city of the Armenians and in recent years the Emperor of the Ottoman Turks has

taken it by force, destroying the city with fire and sword, and all of the Christian citizens of either sex at or over forty years of age were mercilessly butchered like cattle, while those under that age were led away captives, one portion to be sold under the spear and the other kept in chains under the promise of ransom to be paid. These facts, the noble John of Tabriz has recently testified to most humbly, with those also redeemed from captivity with him in Italy, prostrated at the feet of the Pontif Paul (Paul III 1468-1549, pope from 1534); they begged suppliantly for alms from the Church and in the Plazas of the City. We ought now reintroduce the reader to the Armenian script: of the thirty-nine elements of the written figures, we will speak first concerning the vowels and then of the consonants, which together with the former make up the words of Armenian. Consequently, it is necessary to place all in plain sight so that we begin by returning to the basic order of the alphabet. These, therefore, are the Armenian letters with their names written beneath each of them.'

The Indian Pontiff could be from either India (India or Ethiopia). Prester John was a mythic figure, whose realm moved from Central Asia to India to Africa depending on the sources. (Mayerson; Sanders; Forbath) It is very intriguing that Ambrogio would trot out such a figure as this when he had John of Tabriz and Matthew, the envoy of the Ethiopians, to inform him concerning Armenian realities. The fact that Sanders and many other scholars note the search for Prester John to have partially motivated Henry the Navigator, popes and the kings of Spain in their financial backing of expeditions to the East and Africa suggests an answer. The Armenians were using this mythic connection because of this ruler's popularity with the patrons that they were dealing with; the fable held more promise of success than the truth. The Patriarch Simas could refer to the Chaldaean Patriarchs of the Shim'uns (some eight of that name are recorded). (Frazee p. 57; Graf) Ambrogio was entirely entranced with the Chaldean Church and the Nestorians were living close to Armenia proper and had major seats in Diyarbakir and Mosul. It is distrubing that an earlier and widely reprinted book, Bernhard von Breydenbach's *Peregrinatio in Terram Sanctam* (1486), gives a much more realistic and practical description of actual Armenian prelates and religious practices. (Nersessian 1990)

The references to Christians as people of the cincture or belt is made again by Postel (1538, folio recto 8) where he refers to the Chaldaeans as living among the Mountains of Lebanon,

where they are known vulgarly as the 'Christianos de zona.' Postel may be the source of the remark in Ambrogio as he was widely travelled in the Levant. It is interesting that in the very same passage he refers to 'Vir ad rem Christianam ornandam natus, Frater Ambrosius Papiensis Ferrariae...' The very learned Prof. Richard also notes that the Copts were known as 'people of the belt,' and that such distinguishing sumptuary codes were commonly forced upon Christians in Muslim states.

What would be more natural than that two men recently driven from their homes should become fast friends. It is also possibly the language's recent instruction which accounts for its disproportionate inclusion in the book.

I am suggesting that John had been only recently ransomed and that he was the source of Ambrogio's interest in Armenian; of course, Ambrogio, being a born scholar and collector of curiosities, did not stop with one source of information, but immediately sought out other Armenians in Venice and its environs to augment his heady stream of information from John. Nonetheless, all of Ambrogio's material is based upon Eastern, not Western dialectal information.

John was most likely a Catholic given his enlargement by the Dominicans; he is also labelled a nobleman: something useful to claim when travelling in a foreign country, but also something very likely true. John was very literate in his native tongue and had given Ambrogio access to a number of works; his education would have been difficult to obtain if he had not some status in his community.

Part IV: The Armenian Works Used:

If John was the a source of Armenian books for Ambrogio, these books have some peculiarities that suggest that the texts used in the Catholic Armenian communities of the East were not the same as the received canon.

I have compared Ambrogio's biblical references to the Zohrabian and the American Bible Society's Grabar Bibles and there are a number of disparaties. Yet, most of these could be simple scribal errors or the diffusion of dialectal or vulgar forms into the text.

One example of this is Ambrogio's consistent transcription of God as /Astutz/ (a Middle Armenian form). But an even more interesting feature is the inclusion of the original Psalmist's words (Psalm 21 [Armenian text], but 22 [King James]) rather than those in the New Testament: The received text in both Mark and Matthew has Jesus cry out on the cross, Աստուած իմ, Աստուած իմ, ընդէ՞ր Թողեր զիս։ but in Ambrogio it has become, Աստուծ Աստուծ իմ Նաեաց առ իս ընդեր Թողեր զիս։ which besides having the Old Testament material, is translitered as `Astuz Astuz im naieaz arh is, iendier tholier (notice `l' for `gl').' Ambrogio also notes that the text follows the Old Church Slavic or Macedonian. (Ambrogio 39a)

Other Armenian material includes passages from Porphyry and Aristotle and liturgical prayers such as the Credo.

Ambrogio is a man of the Renaissance, and as such, has an inordinant confidence in the acquisition of truth from books: one needs only find the right books. And if the Greek holds a treasure, what other treasures may lie further afield?

The alphabet for him is not a lambent, changeable thing, but a hard and fast gift from the Diety. His notion of vowel or consonant is as much involved with the genetic relations between the present letters' values and their historical values in Hebrew, but this is a two-way road of truth: present values can define ancient values. Thus, if the Eta of Greek derives from Semetic Heth, then Heth and all its derivatives are vowels as Eta must be considered. See his classification of the letters.

There must be a good deal of investigation into the background of these notions. Especially into the grammatical ideas of Hebraists of the day and also into the influence of cabalists upon

the set ideas of the relation between letter and its sound. This is a matter that Ambrogio sets out in his preface and continues to return to throughout 400 pages.

That this idea is strange to us should not prejudice us against the possible directions it gave Ambrogio's interests, and these directions could in turn improve Ambrogio's usefulness as a phonological witness. That the problem of the affricates so engaged him also makes his transcriptional difficulties worthy of close study so as to tease out some, perhaps, surprising bits of information.

The first task, however, is a thorough comparative study of his whole system and that will be a major one.

Part V: Linguistic Commentary on the Major Texts Found in Ambrogio, Postel and Rivola

Translation is an art colored by the proposed purpose of the text within the culture to which it is being translated (in the magical sense of unintermediated travel). For the language to be translated, it first must be translated through space. The text is transposed and made at home in a new place with new surroundings for a wide or a narrow audience and within that public it often is assumed to be untranslated (remember the row that occurred in Munich when a new translation of `Hamlet' replaced the canonical 19th century version or in America when a new Bible translation superseded the `King James Version'). The Bible has been often translated into Greek, but the Septuagint differs greatly from Origen's word-for-word version.

I would like to explore the nature of the public that Armenian diasporans of the early 16th century and their European confreres sought to impress with the Armenian language: what language did they offer; why did they choose this vehicle over another; how did the Europeans working with them understand and use the language(s) they were offered, and what were the subsequent effects of this introduction on the growth of a European concept of the Armenians and their language.

I emphasize here that it was more the willingness of Armenians to share their tongue with the foreign scholars than the scholars' relentless quest after new tongues that I think should be investigated. Unfortunately, the Armenian informants are largely nameless (except in the case of Ambrogio) and when they are named, the information given is very scant (Strohmeyer 1995, pp. 174-175).

Teseo Ambrogio remained the most cited European author in the books dedicated to the teaching of Armenian in the 16th and early 17th centuries: Postel's book is derived from his although it was published a year earlier (1538) and Rivola's Grammar and Dictionary (1624/1621: reprinted 1633) consistently refer to his work, which is a rich depository of Armenian's dialectal contradictions although similar disparities covertly reside in every language.

As we shall see, Ambrogio's purpose differed radically from the purposes of his two followers: Postel was hurriedly publishing a feast for the eye in order to garner the favor of Francis I so that he might be given the post of Orientalist Extraordinaire at the University of Paris (Kuntz, pp. 32-34) while Rivola was continuing the long journey of translating Catholic works into an `Latinized Armenian,' (Nichanian, pp. 255-257), a language understood as a civil tongue used to communicate business and politics, that would further the goal of the Propagation of the Faith among the Ottoman Christians (Postel dreamed rather of Christianizing the Muslims themselves).

Teseo Ambrogio shared some of these reasons, but it is clear from his book that his deepest impulses came from his search for the original written tongue: Man's first visual speech and perhaps man's first audible speech, for Ambrogio was Kabbalistically intoxicated by the theory of the derivation of all alphabets from the Hebrew and it colors all of his thinking (Postel, of course, spent his life in a similar quest, but he did not consider Armenian the key-language that Ambrogio did). Typically, his manuscripts and his last book were stamped with a distinctive signet-seal: the names of the Hebrew letters written out in the Armenian forming a rough circle. Furthermore, the Latin identification of the owner (even on the inside cover of his manuscript Hebrew-Latin Dictionary) is written in Armenian script.

We will examine the changes undergone by the prayer `Hayr Mer' during its journey from Ambrogio's manuscript `Breviary' to his work on comparative alphabets to Postel's very brief work of a similar nature to Rivola's Grammar. As we shall see, the text undergoes strange transliterations, pronunciations and orthographic depredations, and some of these are fascinatingly redolent with various dialectal adhesions to the Grabar of the Golden Age. When we look at the manuscript, we shall see that Ambrogio is utterly faithful to the givens of his prize and that it is the so often repeated prayer that has become somewhat mangled as has the `Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag' by the thoughtless, but reverent repetition of millions of school children.

Part VI: The Original Manuscript Sources for the `Ambrogio Tradition'

In the University of Pavia's Library of manuscripts are found the remnants of Teseo Ambrogio's library from his monastery in the same city. Most of his typefaces and books were destroyed in the sacking and occupation of the city by the French between 1525 and 1527, but he recovered what he could and started his Orientalist typography again in Ferrara, whence he returned to Pavia by way of Venice before his death (Terenzio, pp. 9-11).

The codices that interest us most are numbered 346 and 347 in the university's catalogue of manuscripts and are described as a `Diurninum armenicum' and a `Breviarium' by F. Conybeare, who dates them by their colophons to the 14th century. (de Marchi, pp. 190-191)

These are clearly Ambrogio's as identified by his name and his family's written in Latin, but in Armenian script, and by the presence of his stamp of the names of the Hebrew alphabet again written in Armenian script. These inscriptions appear again in his vademecum mentioned above. Note that Conybeare mentions a third, now lost religious manuscript, which is possibly an Armenian Psalter created for the Armenian Chalcedonian community. (see my work on the Psalms cited in the *Introductio...*).

Ambrogio has interlineated these entire books with Latin glosses for each word and numerous marginal notes.

When we compare the traditional text of Matthew 6, 9-14 from the Zohrabian Bible with the text from the `Breviarium' leaf 96$^{r/v}$, we see a few peculiar forms which have been copied from text to text, no doubt, because although the copyist knew their more common alternatives, he refrained from altering a sacred book that had come to him for accurate preservation. Ambrogio and Postel record these peculiarities in the same spirit, while Rivola, the far more liguistically practical and curious, does much to bring the text closer to the oral tradition that he knew.

I have underlined the words and copyist's idiosyncracies that have caused interpretive difficulties for subsequent readers.

One of the truly bizarre forms is դ.ես in the first relative clause (Ajamian; Weitenberg). The Grabar text early on had an alternate that included the copula `you are' although the Greek model did not contain it. At some point a second-person possessive marker was added to heaven, giving `thy heaven' յերկինսդ, and this was subsequently misdivided in Ambrogio's copying of the original manuscript so that the first form was achieved. Rivola comments on this դ.ես in his grammar (p. 296) and accounts for it as a form of the copula infected with the pronoun of the second person singular much as modern linguists account for the `t' (from `thou') in poetic English forms `dost' and `art' or common German `bist.' Ambrogio's misreading became a common part of most printed 'Hayr Mer's throughout the 16th and 17th centuries in Italy, Germany and France. (Nersessian)

1. The traditional Grabar text of the `Hayr Mer:'
Հայր մեր որ յերկինս, սուրբ եղիցի անուն քո. եկեսցէ արքայութիՒն քո. եղիցին կամք քո որպես յերկինս՝ եւ յերկրի. ԶՀաց մեր Հանապազորդ տուր մեզ այսօր. եւ Թող մեզ զպարտիս մեր, որպես եւ մէք Թողումք մերոց պարտապանաց. եւ մի՝ տանիր գմեզ ի փորձութիՒն, այլ փրկեա գմեզ ի չարէն.

զի քո է արքայութիւն և զօրութիւն և փառք յաւիտեանս. ԱՄԷՆ:

2. The following is the text found in Ambrogio's manuscript #347:

Հայր մեր որ յերկինսդ ես ս~ք եղիցի անուն քո: Եկեսցէ արքայութի~ քո եղիցին կամք քո որպէս յերկինս և յերկրի: զՀաց մեր Հանապա()զորդ [there is a space in the manuscript marked by the parentheses] տուր մեզ այսաւր և թող մեզ զպարտիս [sic] մեր որպէս և մեք թողումք մերոց պարտպանաց [sic] և մի տանիր զմեզ ի փորձութի~: այլ փրկեայ [sic] զմեզ ի չարէ: [sic] զի քո է արքայութի~ և զաւրութի~ և փառք յաւիտեանս: ԱՄԷՆ

The `tildas' mark the abbreviations and are over the letter combinations or the final `ini' in the manuscript. It is also after the hand of this copyist that Teseo models his Armenian font.

MS 347 shows distinct influences from the Vulgate (especially in Ecclesiasticus, which will be discussed in another Chapter), but the earliest translation of the Vulgate into Armenian is by Father Augustine Awetiq O.P. in Venice, 1380 perhaps years after the Lectionary's completion. (Oudenrijn) However, the Vulgate cannot account for the inclusion of a second person pronoun into the phrase 'in heaven,' nor does MS 347 have an extant colophon, so we cannot be sure whether it is a production contemporary with MS 346.

Part VII: Ambrogio's Printed Version of 1539

The table of the Armenian alphabet and its Latin equivalents clearly show that Ambrogio was aware of its pronunciational variants, but it is equally clear that he preferred the Eastern values for the transcription of his texts.

3. These are the sounds Ambrogio has heard connected with the letters:

ա   (ayp/a)   մ   (miem/m)

բ   (byen, pyen/b, p)   յ   (i/i)

ꟼ	(giem, chiem/g, c)	Ն	(nu/n)
Դ	(da, ta/d, t)	Չ	(sa, scha/s, sc)
Ե	(iech/e, ie)	Ո	(vua/o)
Ʊ	(za/z)	Շ	(secha, zia/s, z)
Ē	(ae,e)	Պ	(pe, be/p, b)
Ը	(iet/ie)	Ջ	(sche, zche/sc, ch, q, z)
Թ	(tho/th)	Ռ	(rha, rra/rh, rr)
Ժ	(ge, ze, xe/g, z, x)	Ս	(se/s)
Ի	(ini/i)	Վ	(viech, vieu, vieph/u [v])
Լ	(luen/l)	Տ	(tuen, duen/t, d)
Ւ	(hhe/hh)	Ր	(re/r)
Ծ	(dha, tza, zza/dh, tz, zz)	Ց	(zzo/zt, zz)
Կ	(chien, gien, kien, quien/c, g, k, q)	Ւ	(yun, phyun/ y [ypsilon])
Հ	(ho/h)	Փ	(puir, psiur/p, ps)
Ձ	(ssa, tsa, zza/ss, ts, zz)	Ք	(che/ch)
Ղ	(glal, gal/gl, l)	ԵՒ	(ieu/eu)
Ճ	(ie, gie, hie/i, g, h)	Ֆ	(phe/ph) Օ (aypyun/o).

The transcription of the affricates is very poor and many sound values are based upon the Greek originals rather than the Armenian as with ps and ph. (Ambrogio, 143ab)

It is very odd that Ambrogio correctly expanded the text's abbreviation of `holy' while completely misunderstanding the common abbreviation of - թիւն as `-thai.' Because we know that he had extensively glossed all of his texts with Latin and seemed to understand the Armenian inflection system, this insensitivity is doubly puzzling: one interpretation is that Ambrogio's informant (John of Tabriz) spoke a denasalizing dialect (Strohmeyer, 1995, p. 174). If the final nasal colored the vowel and then was lost, we would expect to find the forms which are attested on pages 174b-175a, `-uthai, -uthene, and -uthab.'

Although there is no known dialect which has undergone such a transformation in this declension, Ambrogio's material suggests that the ablative retained its nasal due to the flanking

vowels while the nominative/accusative and the genative/dative merged into a common denasalized `central vowel' and the instrumental had the same vowel in a syllable ending in a voiced bilabial.

4. Ambrogio's printed version:

Հայր (Hair/Pater) մեր (mer/noster) որ (or/qui) յերկինս (iercins/in coelis) դես (des/es [sic]) սուրբ (surb/sanctum) եղիցի (eglizzi/sit) անուն (anun/nomen) քո (cho/tuum). եկեսցէ (eceszze/veniat) արքայութա́ի (archaiuthai [sic]/regnum) քո (cho/tuum) եղիցին (eglizzin/fiant) կամք (camch/placita) քո (cho/tua) որպես (orpes/sicut) յերկինս (iercins/in coelo) և (eu/et) իերկրի (iercri [sic]/in terra). զՀաց (Zhazt/Panem) մեր (mer/nostrum) Հանապաչորդ (hanapazord [sic] /suprasubstatialem) տուր (tur/da) մեզ (mez/nobis) այսաւր (aisaur [!] աւ for o/hodie) և (eu/et) թող (thogl/remitte) մեզ (mez/nobis) զպարտիս (zpaartis [sic]/debita) մեր (mer/nostra) որպես (orpaes/sicut) և (eu/et) մեք (mech/nos) թողումք (thoglumch/remittimus) մերոց (merozt/nostris) պարտապանաց (partpanazt [sic]/debitoribus) և (eu/et) մի (mi/ne) տանիր (tanir/ducas) զմեզ (zmez/nos) ի (i/in) փորձութա́ի (phorxuthai [sic]/tentationem) այլ (ail/sed) փրկեայ (pharceai [sic]/libera) զմեզ (zmez/nos) ի (i/a) չարէ (zarae/malo). զի (zi/quem) քո (cho/tuum) է (ae/est) արքայութա́ի (archaiuthai [sic]/regnum) և (eu/et) զաւրութա́ի (zauruthai [!] [sic]/virtus) և (eu/et) փառք (pharchch/gloria) յաւիտեանս (iauiteans/insecula). Ամէն (amen [sic]/amen). (Ambrogio, 185b)

Ambrogio is as concerned with the historical origins of the Armenian letters as he is with an accurate transcription of the sounds he heard; therefore we must be careful when using his Latin rendering of the Armenian (Strohmeyer, 1995, p. 175-178).

Turning now to Postel's rendering, we recognize his phonetic acuity in his accurate and very modern descriptions of the sounds of the Armenian alphabet and are also disappointed that he gives such a short, cursory and sloppy version of the text.

Part VIII: Postel's Printed Text of 1538

Rather than spend over 200 pages on Armenian matters as does Ambrogio, Postel covers the language in only four pages within his short description of twelve alphabets. I have already mentioned the haste with which this project was completed and there are many ridiculous errors because of it.

Postel describes the Georgians with geographical accuracy and then gives the Coptic alphabet as their own. It is very difficult to explain away such an unnecessary error. (Postel, pp. 53-55) On the other hand, Postel spends more than 20 pages on Arabic and six on Greek and in these sections he is especially impressive with the phonetic accuracy of his descriptions of these alphabets' pronunciation.

It is clear from the entire chapter on the Armenians that those Armenians that he met in his travels spoke Turkish and that he considered the Armenian language a liturgical fossil: whoever served as his informant spoke a very different dialect from Ambrogio's and he did not or could not give Postel a great deal of accurate grammatical information; equally likely, Postel never asked for it. (Postel, pp. 63-66)

Postel then could offer us a good description of the music, but he did not seem to care much for the song's lyric.

5. These are the sounds Postel has heard connected with the letters:

Ա (ayp, a)

Բ (bpien, b.durum inter b.&p.)

Գ (gqim, g forte inter q.&g.)

Դ (dta, d durum inter d.& t.)

Ե (iech Latinaa E. vel Graeca est e.)

Զ (za/z)

Է (e, i)

Ը (iet/ie)

Մ (mim/m)

Յ (hi h. vel i.)

Ն (nu/n)

Շ (scha Hebraeum.)

Ո (vva u. consonum.)

Չ (ccha c. forte vel dupplex.)

Պ (be, b Illirica buchi inversa est.)

Ջ (gge ge duriusculum.)

Թ (to/te) Ռ (ra,r) Ժ (ge, g)

Ի (ini/i) Ս (se/s)

Լ (luen, Latina est l) Վ (vief, v)

Խ (che/ch) Տ (tun, t)

Ծ (tza, tz) Ր (re si occludas Graeca est r.)

Կ (qguien, g fortiter prolatum a palato.) Ց (tso s forte)

Ւ (un, vel fun, vel fiun, digamma aeolicum.)

Փ (puir, p)

Հ (hho H. aspirato fortis vel duplex.) Ք (ke k vel c vel q.)

Ձ (tsa ts. vel ss. durum) Ե ([reads as `k'] ief vel chief leniter aspirando a graecis k.)

Ղ (gat g.ut profertur cum a, o, u.) Ֆ (phe a Graecis ph.)

Ճ (gie g. stricta cum lingua interiori parte palati.) Օ (ayp, iun, au, vel o. duae sunt literae ayp, & fiun:).

The transcription of the affricates is very poor and many sound values are based upon the Greek originals rather than the Armenian as with `yev' and `ph'; also note that Postel explains the `huin' as a form of the lost `digamma' while also recording Ambrogio's theory that it is the `ypsilon.' (Postel, pp. 62-66) The primacy of Greek in Postel's thinking should not blind us to the phonological acuity represented in the `digamma' theory.

6. Postel's printed version:

Հայր (Hair) մեր (mer) որ (vr) յերկինս (hierchins) դես (des [sic]) սրբոյ (srboi) եղիցի (ezisi) անուն քո (anoncho). եկե- սցէ (ekesse) արքայութի~ քո (archaiothaicho [sic]) եղիցին (ezissin) կամք քո (chamkcho) որպէս (vrbis) յերկինս (hierkins) և (ei [sic]) յերկրի (etchri [sic]). զՀաց (Zachaz) մեր (mer) Հանապա- (hanaba [sic]) շորդ (gsord [sic]) տուր (tour) մեզ (mez) այս (ais) աւր (aur [!] աւ for օ) և (ie) թող (touz [sic]) մեր (mer [sic]) զպարտիս (zaabartis [sic]) մեր (mer) որպէս (vrbis) և (ie) մեք (mech) թողումք (tossumc

[sic]) մերոց (merus [sic]) պարտապանաց (bartbanas [sic]) և (ie) մի mi) տանիր (tanir) զմեզ ի փորձու- (zamezprtzo [sic]) թի˜ (tai [sic]) այլ (ail) փրկեալ (phirkai [sic]) զմեզ (zamer [sic]) ի (i) չարէ (zare [sic]). զի քո (zaicho [sic]) է (e) արքայութի˜ (archaiotai [sic]) և (ie) զաւրութի˜ (zairotai [!] [sic]) և (ie) փառք (paouch [sic]) յաւիտեանս (auiteans [sic]). Ամէն (amen [sic]). (Postel, p. 65)

The `tildas' over the `tho-ini' marking abbreviations could be read as `ayps,' thus giving `-thai.' The text is straight from Ambrogio's manuscript, not his later printed version, which did not contain the `tildas' marking abbreviations.

Postel does not show a clear understanding of word division or integrity in his transliteration of the text; moreover, many of his transliterations follow Ambrogio's while others' feature his own auditions, yet there are also frequent sloppy renderings that bring into question the usefulness of Postel's work.

That he renders `h' as `hh' suggests that his informant may have been from the Van area (Greppin, p.230), and his apparent mis-transliteration of `etchri' for Ambrogio's `iercri' has the interesting possibility of following the attested sound change of `r' to `t' in the New Julfa dialect as in `hetkar' for `erkar.' (Vaux, personal communication)

7. This is the second handwritten version of the prayer found on the inside cover of Ambrogio's codex #346:

Հայր մեր որ յերկինս դ.ես [sic] ս˜ք եղեցի [sic] անուն քո: Եկեացէ արքայութի˜ քո եղեցին [sic] կամ.ք քո որպէս յերկինս և յերկրի: զՀաց մեր Հանապ(ու/ա)զորդ տուր մեզ այսաւր և թող մեզ (զ/ձ)պարտիս [sic] մեր որպէս և մեր [sic] թող=ամ.ք [sic] մերոց պարտապանաց [sic] և մի տանիր զմեզ ի փորձութի˜ այլ փրկեալ զմեզ ի չարէ: զի քո (է) [in paretheses in the text] արքայութի˜ և զաւրութի˜ և փառք յաւիտեանս: Ամէն [sic]

Unless otherwise noted, parentheses mark questionable readings of the letters.

For reasons that are very hard to quantify, I would like to think that this version of the `Hayr Mer' written on the lower, inside cover of Ambrogio's Breviarium is Postel's first rendering of Armenian under the tutelage of Ambrogio. It largely follows the manuscript's text, but it has a few oddities that bespeak, to me, of the novelty of the attempt.

If this was Postel's first attempt to render something in Armenian, it probably proceeded by a year his actual preparation of his printed book in Paris and the uncertainty about the identity of `z' recorded here becomes progressively worse as time and distance separate him from his teacher.

Part IX: Rivola's Grammar of 1624

As we have already noted, Francisco Rivola refers to Ambrogio frequently in his grammar and it is Ambrogio's version of the `Hayr Mer' that he uses to illustrate the language in the last section of short texts; however new purposes color his reading of Ambrogio and he differs from his predecessors in his ability to use Armenian as a language of daily communication.

Rivola's Armenian is a vehicle for preaching the Catholic faith and it is this purpose and his assumed Latinate substructure that accounts for the infection of the text with more contemporary forms of the noun and verb. There are also corrections of the text's misspellings, which attest to Rivola's reading in a number of Armenian texts.

8. Rivola, F., *Grammaticae armenae libri quattor*, Milan 1624 Ambrosiana. pp. 2-4:

ա	ալիբ Ayp	A		մ	մեն	Mien	M
բ	բեն	Pien	P		յ	յի	I	I
գ	գեմ	Chiem	Ch		ն	նու	Nu	N
դ	դայ	Ta	T		շ	շայ	Scia	Sc
ե	եչ	Ieg	Ie		ո	ոյ	Vua	V
զ	զայ	Ssa	Ss		չ	չայ	Cci`a	Cc

Է	է	E	E	պ	պէ	Be	B
ը	եղ	Iet	Ie	զ	զէ	Gge	Gg
թ	թաւ	Tho	Th	ռ	ռայ	Rra	Rr
ժ	ժէ	Sgie	Sg	ս	սէ	Se	S
ի	ինի	Ini	I	վ	վեվ	Vieu	V
լ	լիուն	Liun	L	տ	տիուն	Diun	D
խ	խէ	Hhe	Hh	ր	երէ	Ere	R
ծ	ծայ	Zza	Zz	ց	ցաւ	Zzo	Zz
կ	կեն	Ghien	Gh	ւ	հիւն	Hiun	V
հ	հաւ	Ho	H	փ	փիուր	Piur	Pp
ձ	ձայ	Zza	Zz	ք	քէ	Che	Ch
ղ	ղադ Kat	K		և	և	Ieu	Eu
ճ	ճէ	Ge [sic] G		ֆ	ֆէ	Fe	F

9. Rivola has the following version of the `Hayr Mer' obviously taken from Ambrogio:

Հայր Մեր որ յերկինս դես։ սուրբ եղիցի անուն քո։ Եկեսցէ
արքայութի (p. 297 notes that this is an abbreviation which AT never recognized, and also mentions -թեան as the gen. and քոյ as the gen pronoun: full form given is արքայութիւն քոյ) քո։ Եղիցին կամք քո որպէս յերկինս և յերկրի։ զհաց մեր հանապագորդ տուր մեզ յայսաւր [sic]: Թող մեզ զպարտս [corrected/alternate and contemporary form of the word պարտիք] մեր որպէս և մենք [sic/contemporary form of pronoun] թողումք մերոց պարտապանաց [corrected]: և մի տար [sic/contemporary form of imperative] զմեզ ի փորձութիւն [inflection corrected/ sic: he notes both spellings ծ/ց in his grammar, p. 17]: այլ փրկեայ ի չարէ [sic] ամէն։ [sic] (Rivola, p. 294)

10. Further notes taken from Rivola's *Grammar:*

Rivola is exploring the value of 'aw' in polysyllabic words; see below for monosyllables:
p. 4:

բալլորգիր Poluerchir նաւտրգիր Noderchir երկաթագիր Erghathachir

p. 5 գլխագիր Chelhhachir ծաղկագիր Zakghachir գագանագիր Chassanachir.

p. 8:

Հաւապ	Hauad	խաւար	Hhauar
Թագաւոր	Tacauuer	Մեղաւոր	Mekauuer
Լաւ	Lau	ծարաւ	Zarau
Նրսպաւ	Nesdau	բարկացաւ	Parghazzau

p. 9:

Here Rivola argues for a fuller pronunciation in his transcription 'Nauen, etc.) He is careful to avoid a monosyllabic reading:

ցաւն	Zzauen	նաւն	Nauen
լաւն	Lauen	ցաւք	Zzauch
սակաւք	Saghauch		

p. 10:

However he distinguishes the following set from the above:

Հաւր	Hor	աւծեալ	Ozial
Մաւր	Mor	աւրհնեալ	Orhnial
եղբաւր	Ekpor (sic)		
աղաւնի	Akauni	pronounced	Akoni
թաւթի	Thauthi	pronounced	Thothi

p. 15: Sound changes: He notes the variant reading found in his Psalm text:
Litterae աւ բալլոր բոլոր խաւրհիլ խորհիլ գլաւխ գլոխ

բ ա ամբ ps. 76.15 ամա ps. 77.15 ըմբել ps. 35.9 ըմալր ps. 49.13

գ .ք մագեաց (ovium) ps. 64.15 մաքեաց ps. 103.6

դ. տ ընդրել (seligere) ps. 88.17 ընտրել ps. 104.25

անտառ (silva) ps. 82.14 անդար ps. 95.11

գ ս զգենուլ ps. 34.12 սգենուլ ps. 92.1 & 103.2

զգեստ (clothes) ps. 44.10 սգեստ ps. 103.6

p. 16:

կ գ ցանկալ (desire) ps. 61.10 ցանգալ ps. 83.1

խունկ ծունգ ժառանկ ժառանգ

p. 18 Theseus Ambrosius' comparisons are mentioned showing the discrepancies between Armenian and received pronunciation of Biblical names: there is no evidence that Rivola understood the dialect situation. Rivola uses Ambrogio's text extensively in his Grammar and his Dictionary, but he did not use his MSS; see below.

p. 20 De divisione litterarum Armenorum in vocales, semi vocales, et consonantes: Chapter VII.

pp. 30-31

Examples of the use of դես as the second person singular form of the verb `to be.' Most of these examples from the Psalms do not appear in the Zohrabian text. In every case Rivola has misinterpretted or incorrectly divided the phrases in the Bible. None of these quotations can come from MS 347; Rivola must have other Armenian manuscripts than those in Ambrogio's possession; he may have possessed, however, the lost Psalter:
Matth. 6. The Pater Noster (not in Zohrabian)
Ps. 117, 24. որ գալոցդես Qui venturus es (not in Zohrabian)
Ps. 122, 1 որ բնակեալդես (որ բնակեալդ ես in Zohrabian) Qui habitas
Matth. 8 որպէս Հաւապոցերդ (in Zohrabian, but not in MS 347)

1 Corinthians 5 Էքդ (Էքդ) անիմուր (անիմորք) (in Zohrabian, but not in MS 347)

Matth. 26 վաան որոյ եկիրդ (in Zohrabian, but not in MS 347)

p. 285 Abbreviations : -թք = -թամք

p. 296 դես -Es: dictio composita ex littera affixa դ, quae vim habet representandi pronomen secundae personae singularis, affigturque interdum in (ir?) principio verbi, sic uti habetur fol 30., Ex secunda persona singularis Praesentis verbi substantiva, quod describitur fol 185.

There is only one more extended Armenian text found in Rivola, Psalm 1. It is almost certain that Rivola was using Abgar of Toxath's Psalter, printed in Venice in 1565/66 as all of the variant spellings in Rivola's text can be found there; moreover, Nercessian notes that a copy can be found in the Ambrosiana. (Frazee p. 48; Nercessian p. 47). Therefore, for the sake of completeness, I include that text as well and will give the Zohrabian variant readings in parentheses. Rivola 303-311:

երանեալէ (երանեալ է) այր որ ոչ գնաց ի խորհուրդս
Beatus est   vir qui non ambulavit in consiliis
ամբարշտաց (ամպարշտաց.): ի ճանապարհի մեղաւորաց
impiorum.   in via peccatorum
նայ (նա) ոչ եկաց: և յաթոռս ժանդից (ժանտից) նայ (նա) ոչ
ille non stetit.   & in cathedra prauorum   ille   non
նստաւ. այլ յաւրէնս (յօրէնս) տեառն են կամք նորայ
sedit.   sed in lege   Domini sunt voluntates eius
(նորա,): և յաւրէնս (յօրէնս) ն~ր խորհեսցի նայ (նա) ի տուէ և
           & in lege   eius meditabitur   ille   in die &
ի գիշերի: և եղիցի նայ (նա) որպէս ծառ որ տնկեալէ (տնկեալ
in nocte.   & erit   ille   tanquam arbor quae plantata est

Է) ի գՆացս ջուրց, որ զպտուղ իւր ի ժամու տացէ։ և տերև
secus decursus aquarum. Quae fructum suum in tempore dabit. & folium

Ն~ր մի Թափեցի, և զամՆայՆ գորիՆչ (զոր իՆչ) արասցէ
eius non spargetur,   & omne   quod   faciet

յաջողեցի Նմայ (Նմա). ոչ այսպես եՆ ամբարիշտք
prosperabitur ei   non hoc modo sunt impii

(ամպարիշտք) և ոչ այՆ պես (այսպես)։ այլ որպես ՀողՄ
                       & non illo   modo.   sed sicut vetus

գփոշի, զի Հոսէ իվերայ (ի վերայ) երեսաց երկրի. վասՆ
puluerem, quoniam spargit desuper   facies   terrae. Propter

այսորիկ ոչ յարիցեՆ ամբարիշտք (ամպարիշտք) ի
hoc   non surgent   impii   in

դատաստաՆ։ և ոչ Մեղ աւորք ի խորՀուրդս արդաոց
iudicio.   & neque peccatores in consilio   iustorum.

(արդարոց). քաՆզի ճաՆաչէ տէր գճաՆապարՀս արդարոց։
                     Quoniam cognoscit Dominus vias   iustorum.

ճաՆապարՀք ամբարշտաց (ամպարշտաց) կորիցեՆ.
viae   impiorum   peribunt.

The last version of the `Hayr Mer' derived from our original manuscript was written in a
separate hand in the upper, inside cover of Ambrogio's Breviarium. It displays quite another
attitude toward the prayer: a preacher's explication and paraphrase into the common tongue of
a well known prayer.

Despite the many mistakes in spelling and interpretation of the Armenian letters, this is written
by someone who has a basic knowledge of spoken Armenian although a lesser ability with the
written, classical language.

This is just the intellectual fingerprint that would fit Rivola and I consider this text the first
exercise that he attempted in the classical language: trying to discern the words that he knew
by ear in a text, which he could only barely read.

This text uses only the digraph `aw' for `omega' and it is to be noted that Rivola seems completely ignorant of that letter or that he considers it an innovation that he should avoid; moreover, the slavish usage of letter-forms derived from the hand of the text suggests that the writer is a tyro.

11. The first handwritten version on Codex #346's inside cover page:

Հայր մեր/ որ յերկինս դես: [sic] ս~բէ. անուն քո. եկեցէ
արքայութիւն քո ելիցի [sic] տ~ր կամք քո որպէս [sic] յերկին
յերկինս Մ-յ (3~-յ) երկրի. Զ Հաց մեր այաւր [sic],
Հանապա(ի/ւ)շորդ տուր մեզ: եւ թող մեզ բզորսրտրս [sic]
[բզպարտիս] մեր: եւ արձանի արայ թողուլ մերոց
պարտապանաց [corrected/Medieval Armenian paraphrase of the original]: եՄի
[բՄի] տարի [տար ի] փորձութիւն: այլ փրրկեա ի չարէն
[corrected]: (ք/զ)(կ/Հ)պերտիս [զպարտիս] աՄէն: ի սրբութիւն
սրբոց: դա. Միայն ս~բ: Միայն տ~ր յ~ս ք~ս ի փառս ա~յ
Հա(ւ/ի)ր [Հօր] աՄէն: աՄէն: աՄէն: աՄէն: դա Հայր ս~բ որդ իտ
[sic] ս~բ Հոգի ս~բ ա(ւ/ի)ր(կ/Հ)նութիւն [օրՀնութիւն] Հաւր եւ
որդոյ եւ սրբո(յ/գ) Հոգւոյն եւ այժմ եւ Միշտ եւ յախիտեանն(յ
[sic/Jesus?] /յ)սախտէնից [sic] [յաւիտեանս յաւիտենից] աՄէն [sic]

Parentheses contain alternate readings of the handwritten letter and brackets, my suggested corrections; the writer uses two forms of `hiun,' one of which resembles a miniscule `ini' and in some cases the reading `ini' makes greater sense. His writing is modelled after the hand of the manuscript itself and this suggests that he has had no prior training in Armenian. The `tildas' mark abbreviations and the `tildas' used in the text are over the two letters.

Appendix: Speculations Upon the Sources for Rivola's 1621 Armenian-Latin Dictionary:

The 1621 Dictionary and its 1633 reprint in Paris represent the first work of Rivola's in the Armenian field. Since I have already demonstrated the extraodinary dependence upon Ambrogio that Rivola displays in his Grammar of 1624, it might be expected that similar influence could be shown in the dictionary: remarkably, that does not seem the case.

The language learning methods used by Ambrogio are generally the same across languages: extensive interlineation of well-known texts collected from the target language's community of speakers (the Bible, the liturgy, the Church Fathers, and Aristotle), the creation of a manuscript glossary (we possess the remnants of a Hebrew glossary with his autograph), the copying out of a notebook of illustrative exempla from his collection of manuscripts, and the development of a short grammar, again in some private notebooks, etc. We now possess only examples of a part of this common constellation from different languages. The remainders of his manuscripts are only complete in the case of Armenian; the existence of extensive glossaries is suggested by the partial Hebrew one at Pavia and the word lists contained throughout the *Introductio....* ; a copy book of texts is attested to by the contents of the *Introductio....* and by the manuscript in his hand of Arabic passages from the Gospels (see above); finally, his *Introductio....* contains a short Arabic grammar of Egyptian and North African Arabic in Latin script as well as grammatical notes on all the languages contained therein. We can add to this his clearly attested eagerness to make contact with any and all native speakers that were resident within Italy.

As it is certain that Rivola used the *Introductio....* and that he might have had access to the Pavian collection of Armenian manuscripts (all before 1624), we might expect to find the Ambrogian Armenian glossary embedded in the Rivolan Dictionary. I have tried to find some evidence of this, but I have found only enticing suggestions that the material in the dictionary was cetainly influenced by the *Introductio...*: the spelling of many of the long list of Biblical names in 'A' show Eastern dialect rather than Western dialect influences although that influence is not carried throughout the dictionary or the later Grammar (there we find almost only Western influence). Any evidence fo a now-lost glossary remains questionable; it may have been destroyed after Ambrogio's death or it may not have been kept with his other papers in the monastic library in Pavia.

Some selections from the peculiarities of Rivola's dictionary would expose the reader to Rivola's sources and prejudices. The 1621 edition collected for Cardinal Borromeo's new Ambrosian Library in Milan was reprinted in 1633, in a reset edition with far more compression of the text, in Paris for Cardinal Richelieu. There are no textual changes between the editions except for introductory letters to the respective patrons and the occasional misprint in the Parisian: e.g. 'ghazaros' is reset as 'ghtzaros;' where the Armenian 'a' is easily mistaken for a printed 't.'

In order to garner some evidence that Ambrogio's manuscripts had been used, I carefully examined the dictionary's lexicon, noticing that it contained a surprising number, especially in the first few letters of the alphabet, of plant names and proper names from the Bible for such a short lexicon; Ambrogio's MS 178 in the present Pavian collection opens with 12 leaves of botanical names (importantly Greek names transcribed into Armenian with an Armenian gloss) and etymologies of the names of Biblical personalities. The use of these folios would considerably skew the percentage of such items among the more common words. Moreover, many of these items are represented by two words, which would be the case for those derived from the botanical MS 178.

My conclusions, however, must be more negative than positive. Clearly, Rivola knew of Ambrogio's published work (most of the material from the manuscripts was available there), but there is little hard evidence that Rivola had the manuscripts to work from during his lexicographical work on the dictionary. This does not disprove the existence of an Ambrogian glossary; it merely suggests that Rivola did not know about it or chose, for reasons of his own, not to use it.

The dictionary does list a great number of Old Testament names predominantly in the early letters of the alphabet, and the transcription of these varies wildly between the Western dialectal phonology and the Eastern (with the caveat, that the apparent Eastern pronunciation might be in reality an influence of the Latin or Italian pronunciation of these names). For

example, Latin Achab transcribes the Armenian letters 'Ak^{h}ap, ' yet Abacuch is from 'Abaguk^h,' Abiud from 'Abiut^h,' and Abdias from 'Abdiay.'

This last suggests no transcription, but clearly only the normal Latin form for the Armenian one (see also Azarias from 'Azareay' and Absalon from 'Abisoghum' [the Haigazean Dictionary has 'Abesoghom']). There may be no unique system at work here and again Ambrogio himself takes special notice of the varying pronunciations and orthographics of the same word within the Armenian community in his published work. All of this becomes a main concern of Rivola's first section on the alphabet and its pronunciation in his 1624 Grammar.

Among botanical references there are 'kinamon' (clearly Greek), 'sonk' (Haigazean and common 'sunk'; Rivola's form is common to Goris and Gharabagh according to Acharyan) and 'sisarbugh.' Unfortunately none of these are found on the manuscript list.

To continue some dialectal notes, Rivola's transcriptions repeatedly show forms missing the common initial 'yod,' especially before 'a.' It is not clear why this should be. He also displays intial 'h' before 'a' where the more common form lacks the 'h.' Examples of these cases include 'Abet^h,' Haigazean 'Yabet^h,' Japheth [the Grabar initial 'y' would have been pronounced as an 'h', but see below for non-psilotic forms]; 'awt^{h}anasun' 70 for Haigazean 'eôt^{h}anasun, ewt^{h}anasun, or eawt^{h}anasun' [Meillet] (see Acharyan's common 'oxt^{h}anasun' found from Tbilisi to Yerevan), and 'halivor,' old, grey bearded for Haigazean 'alewor, alowor' (Acharyan gives aspirated forms from the Western, Hamshin, and the Eastern, Yerevan, dialects and even notes initial 'x-' in Van).

Rivola includes other strange forms in his list of the names of nations: 'hapash' Ethiopian whereas the Haigazean has 'habash' and 'hawrrmaston and hawrrmerên' (a misprint for 'hawrrmastan or hôrrmastan') Greece, the Greek language and the common 'hrrovm' Rome whereas the Haigazean does not recognize this form as a variant for the Byzantines or the Arabic Rumi, and only gives it as meaning Rome or Latin, 'hrrovm, hrrom, hrrovmerên or horrmerên.'

This last example is an intriguing remnant of an older situation when the same word had a spelling variant so as to distinguish European Rome from Anatolian Rome.

Rivola confounds Armenian 'o,' 'aw,' and 'ô,' and in his time, they would have all had the same pronunciation. In general, Rivola shows an orthographic influence from Ambrogio's manuscript Pavia 347, which always uses the 'aw' digraph for the more common 'ô;' however, no manuscript commonly renders initial 'vo' or 'o' as 'aw', while Rivola commonly does and follows Ambrogio's speculations in doing so (see *Introductio....* v174-v176) However, this same digraph is also common in the Abgarian Psalter.

Finally, Rivola occasionally has made an insidious error or he continues an older dialectal tradition: e.g. he lists 'ghamar' and 'aregakn' as both words meaning 'sun.' Today these would clearly represent the common collocation, 'the moon and the sun' or more commonly 'the sun and the moon.' It is hard to believe that his informant mistakenly identified 'ghamar' as the sun without actually having some basis for the semantic variant. It is possible that Rivola simply noted down heavenly bodies and forgot that they were not the same.

However, there remains the possibility that in some dialect area of Armenia, the less common word for moon, 'ghamar,' (Arabic) shifted its semantics to become 'sun.'

Chapter II: A Detailed Philosophical and Linguistic Commentary   on All of the Remaining Armenian Texts Found in the *Introductio...*

Part I: A Return to Ambrogio's Philosophy of Transcription:

The first order of business is to examine just what Ambrogio and Postel have to say about Latin as a language among their languages. This will give us a clear guide concerning Ambrogio's subsequent use of Latin as a transcriptional instrument:

Ambrogio's transcription instrument is the Latin alphabet and it would be most proper if we carefully examine the actual connections (historical/geneological, etymological and philosophical/theological) that Ambrogio posits between Latin and its various precursors.

The translation of Ambrogio's comments on Latin follow. What becomes apparent in his use of Latin as a transcription medium is that he does not recognize the crucial differences between Latin based and other alphabets discussed by Gamkrelidze in a recent book. Gamkrelidze and many Western commentators (Gelb, Jensen, etc.) note that the Latin alphabets are not phonetic/phonemic instruments establishing a unitary sound (usually a phoneme) connected to a unitary sign; rather, the alphabet uses a limited number of signs to represent sounds in the language in at least three ways: 1. Sign = phone, 2. combination of signs (2, 3 or 4) = phone, 3. sign/signs in a syllabic or word position = phone (initial 'd' does not equal medial 'd' does not equal final 'd'; 'c' can have at least three values: s, k, and ch).

Most other alphabets have attempted to limit this sort of variation, but Ambrogio posits just such a potential multi-valency as common to all alphabets. This will become clearer as we examine the minutiae of his argumentation and transcription of Armenian.

The translation from Folio 11: **Latinorum Vocales. The Latin Vowels**
'Latin possesses five vowels: a, e, i, o, and u; to these has been added y ypsilon from the Greek. '

This succinct passage is followed by a commentary on the seven Greek vowels, which Ambrogio finds as well in the following alphabets that he gives examples of in an appendix to his book: Egyptian, Babylonian, Saracenic, Hieroglyphic, Gothic, Etruscan, Aeolic, Magian, etc. (Folios 191-207) This he pronounces the cardinal and divine system ordained by God in the Highest for the best comprehension of mankind. (Folio verso 11)

The translation from Folios 28- recto 30: **De Latinorum consonantibus. Concerning the Latin Consonants**

This section begins with a long excursus on the actual value of two intrusive letters into the original Latin alphabetical repertoire, y and x, and this inaugurates a tempestuous prayer for the confederation of all Christian peoples against the advancing Ottomans. This confederation would ally itself with the non-Christian enemies of the Turkish Emperor and defeat him once for all. Ambrogio considered his book a lingistic beginning to this great enterprise. The phonetic substance of this chapter begins on recto 29:

'Latin has sixteen consonants, namely: b, c, d, f, g, k, l, m, n, p, q, r, s, t, x, and z. The first 'b' coincides with Chaldaic ⊐ Beth and Hebrew ⊐ Beth. 'C' with ⊐ Coph and ⊐ Caph; 'D' with ⊐ Dolad and ⊐ Daleth; 'F' with ⊐ Phe and ⊐ Phe; 'G' with ⊐ Gomal and ⊐ Gimel; 'K' according to some opinions with Chaldaic ⊐ Quoph and Hebrew ⊐ Koph or Quph; 'L' with ⊐ Lomad and ⊐ Lamed; 'M' with ⊐ Mim and ⊐ Mim; 'N' with ⊐ Nun and ⊐ Nun; 'P' has the same origin as 'F' above, Pe [sic] and Phe; 'Q' not otherwise than 'K' Quoph and Quph; 'R' with ⊐ Ris and ⊐ Res; 'S' with ⊐ Somcath and ⊐ Samech; there is no letter corresponding to Chaldaic ⊐ Scin nor evidently to Hebraic ⊐ ⊐ Scin in its two variants and this is particularly interesting; 'T' with ⊐ Teth and ⊐ Teth or ⊐ Thau and ⊐ Thau; 'X' derives from Greek Ξ; and 'Z' with ⊐ Zain and ⊐ Zain and 'doubled zz' with ⊐ Zzode and ⊐ Zzadich or Tsade.

All of these coincide equally with the consonants of Samaritan and Punic, which we have discussed individually above and with the Greek, which will be discussed below. These Latin consonants can be further divided into their sound classes: semivowels, mutes and liquids. The semivowels are f, l, m, n, r, s, and x understood as representing the combination of either cs, gs, or ss (this was commented upon more extensively in the first section of this chapter). The mutes are b, c, d, g, k, p, q, t, & z. The letters i, f, and h, aspiration, are numbered among the mutes by some grammarians. The true liquids, which in Greek are always voiced [noted in the same words in Postel, 1538 Folio verso 23], are l, m, n, & r. Further consonants can be detected through an analysis of the positional sounds of some vowels: i and u, for example, are numbered among the mutes when they precede other vowels...among the semivowels... or among the liquids...'

The relationships between alphabets here are sometimes historically mistaken, while the phonetic information sometimes also contradicts modern and even intuitive categories.

'C,' for example, is clearly a variant on 'G' and both are descendents of Gimel; 'F' is derived from Digamma which is a variant of Vau. The origin of 'K' is the same as 'X' from Greek, and the latter is not directly derived from Ξ but from Chi Χ which had a different value in Greek Italian colonial alphabets.

The classifications of the letters according to sound classes has some other peculiarities: does semivowel mean continuant and why is voicing ignored among the mutes? The answer to the first question is complicated as the aspirated 'F' is both a semivowel and a mute. Yet, why are not z (in the next section on Greek Zita and Lambda are both designated semivowels, Folio recto 30), y, and u included among the semivowels rather than among the mutes? Ambrogio does not see 'voicing' as a crucial characteristic of alphabets. What is clear is the mutability of the phonetic value of the letters and their classifications; obviously, this is one feature common to the Semitic alphabets, where vowels and consonants are frequently positional variants, and phonological variants (s/sh, b/v, d/dh, etc.) having the same shape but varying by means of dots or other diacritics.

Aristotle had broken down the letters into vowels and consonants and these latter further into semivowels and mutes; moreover, Donatus (c. 350 A.D.) listed the following as semivowels: f, l, m, n, r, s, & x. (Collinge, pp. 796-797) This matches exactly with Ambrogio above and Postel below, yet both of them were under the influence of Hebrew grammarians, who had adopted Arab articulatory descriptions. Thus, men like Reuchlin (his Hebrew grammar was published in 1506) made available to all what had come to many through the Jewish scholars in Europe. (Collinge, pp. 811)

As a comparative discussion of the same material and which no doubt influenced Ambrogio, we can examine Postel's three folios (34-37) on the Latin letters in his book of 1538. He borrowed heavily from Ambrogio's materials throughout that book, but, as he was the better practical linguist, he may have advised the older man on linguistic particulars. We must note, however, that Postel's impressive alphabetical charts frequently contain surprising errors: he lists β, γ, δ, as 'tenues' when they are correctly characterized as 'mediae' in Ambrogio. (Postel 1538, folio verso 25; *Introductio...* folio recto 32)

His account of the characteristics of the letters' sound values and their classes are remarkably similar to Ambrogio's: five or six vowels; sixteen or eighteen consonants (depending upon the consonantal values of i & u); h is merely aspiration and neither vowel nor consonant (an interesting position as h can be considered the voiceless vowel); x and z are borrowed from the Greek and the latter is either sd or ss; nine mutes, b,c, d, f, g, k, p, q, & t; seven semivowels, f, l, m, n, r, s, & x; four or six liquids (if one includes y and u), l, r, m, & n. Postel goes on to make further fine distinctions: labial, dental, gingival, palatal, & guttural (the last is defined as a, e, i, o, u, & h, which last derives from an original f with evidence from the Spanish development of Latin, which is a reverse of common etymological understanding!). He then introduces a long section on the accent and a bibliographical essay for further research.

There are three difficulties facing us when we start to utilize the information stored in Ambrogio's transcription system:

1. He had no inclination to create special signs to signify new phonetic items in any of his languages. He felt that he could transcribe any language with the unmodified Latin alphabet (this of course was something that the Poles, Czechs and Lithuanians would have told him was an absurd restriction).

2. He largely decided to maintain the simple values of the Latin letters, and he was not religiously consistent in his use of Latin letter/s for a particular Armenian (or any other alphabetic) letter. However, the rich range of fricatives and affricates in Armenian (far richer than any of his Semitic languages' repertoires of such sounds) is quite beyond the Latin alphabet's possibilities without new signs (see Czech) or extensive di- and trigraphs used consistently (see Polish).

3. We do not know if the contradictions of the text, which was assembled in the last year of Ambrogio's life while he was very ill, represent the final state of his knowledge of the languages or are just the hastily assembled fragments of a life's work without any last editing (although the book may have gone through two separate printings while Ambrogio was still alive. I strongly feel that much here comes from different moments in Ambrogio's learning of his languages and that the informant that might give one section surprising accuracy may be lacking in a closely following section, making Ambrogio prone to foolish errors in transcription and interpretation.

Thus, Ambrogio's transcribed Armenian often seems less than recognizably pronounceable although he displays an ample knowledge of syllable structure and word division on particular pages, as we shall see in the commentary. The whole does not amount to a proper description of the language (something Rivola's reverent use of Ambrogio's materials makes available a century later), but there is much that must detain us as insightful and even exciting if we can discern the system that underlay his use of the Latin letters: did he use a Northern Italian pronunciation? did he sometimes use Latin, French, Spanish and Italian dialectal values? did he take advantage of the orthographic confusion within Northern Italy, where Venetian standard looked far more like Modern Portuguese or Catalan rather than Modern Italian (Postel, 1538 notes the sibilant pronuncition of 'x' in Spain)? Certainly, letters like x, ss, zz, tz, zt, g, s and ch

all appear as transcriptions of affricates or fricatives, while g and ch also appear as unquestioned transcriptions of stops, yet sometimes of different stops (aspirated and unaspirated). Often two or three different transcription decisions are made on the same page.

One possible interpretation of the last situation is that one represents the place of articulation or voicing, while another represents the stridency or period of production. This may be doing some special pleading for a simply unedited last moment attempt to put down a life's work; yet, why would he have waited to the last?: he was a respected teacher and bibliophile, who had been praised for his erudition by numerous scholars from across Europe. How much of this is last moment thoughts and how much well digested fragments from a life-long habit of taking notes?

The least one can say is that Ambrogio consistently transcribed each letter of the Armenian text (often with two or even three letters) showing no clear indication of the placement of schwa or of homorganic epenthesis (some dialects do not display this) so that reproduction of the actual pronunciation from the transcription would be difficult for anyone unfamilar with the original language; however, one could very easily learn to read the language accurately from the transcription.   We have already discussed Postel's description of the alphabet's pronunciation and Rivola's method for learning pronunciation.

Besides the phonological observations, we must consider his morphological interpretations as well. He is quite capable of writing a clear description off some of the inflections of the -Թիւն-thiwn declension on one page and to be wildly of the mark on a closely following page. For some reason, he seems quite aware of the normal manuscript abbreviations at one point and then consistently misinterprets them in most of the book. I have considered the possibility that there may be some evidence for a dialectal contamination of his interpretation: could a lost Armenian dialect have consistently denasalized final syllables after moving word stress to the penultimate (None of the surrounding major languages of the Caucasus show this pattern; Persian, Turkish, Georgian and Armenian show ultimate stress; the Armenian Polish community could be the source of the variation if Polish had a strong affect on the Armenian spoken there, yet Ambrogio's informant claims to be a Tabrizi)?

We will take a second look at these questions as we go through all of the Armenian materials at Ambrogio's disposal.

Part II: The Selection of Longer Armenian Texts Found in Ambrogio's *Introductio...*

1. Ambrogio's Armenian Exercises folio verso 190 and verso 191, Matt. 5 & 10; Matt. 10 is taken from Pavia MS 347 recto/verso 67: The parenthetical text is from the Zohrabian Bible and the italicized words mark variant readings found in Ambrogio. Where there is no transliteration given, it is lacking in Ambrogio's text.

<p align="center">Մաթեոսի. ե.</p>

երանի աղքատաց *հոգով* (Հոգւով), զի նոցա է *արքայութին* (արքայութիւն) երկնից. (:) երանի սգաւորաց, զի նոքա մխիթարեսցին. (:) երանի հեզոց, զի նոքա ժառանգեսցեն զերկիր. (:) երանի որ քաղցեալ և *ծարաւիցեն* (ծարաւի իցեն) *արդա*(inverted)*յութէնէ* (արդարութեան) , զի նոքա յագեսցին. (:) երանի ողորմածաց, զի նոքա *ողորմութաի* (ողորմութիւն) գտցեն. (:) երանի այնոցիկ որ սուրբ են սրտիւք, զի նոքա զա~ծ *տեսցէն* (տեսցեն). (:) երանի *ի*(sic)*խաղաղ արարաց* (խաղաղարարաց), զի նոքա որդիք ա~յ կոչեսցին. (:) երանի որ *հալածեալ իցէն* (հալածեալ իցեն) վ~ն *արդարութ~է* (արդարութեան), զի նոցա է *արքայութաի* (sic corrected in emendations folio 215) (արքայութիւն) երկնից. (:) երանի է ձեզ յորժամ նախատիցեն զձեզ, և հալածիցեն, և ասիցեն զա(inverted) (զամենայն) բան չար զձէն զձաւտ (զձէնջ սուտ) վն իմ. (:) ցնծացէք, և *ուրախ երաք* (ուրախ լերուք), զի վարձք ձեր *բազումէն* (բազում են) յերկինս.

<p align="center">երկոտասանիցն առաքելոցն անուանքն.</p>

ի մաթէոսի. ժ.

Առաջին *սիմոն* (Սիմովն) (,) անուանեալն Պետրոս (,) եւ *Անդրէաս* (Անդրէաս) եղբայր Նորա. *Յակոբոս* (Յակովբոս) *զեբեզա* (Զեբեդեայ). եւ *Յոհաննէս* (Յովհաննէս) եղբայր Նորա. (,) փիլիպպոս եւ բարթողոմէոս. թովմաս. եւ *մաթէոս մաքսաւոր* (մատթէոս մաքսաւոր). *Յակոբոս ալփէա* (Յակովբոս Ալփեայ) եւ դեբէոս որ անուանեցաւն թադէոս. *սիմոն* (Սիմովն) կանանացի. եւ *Յուդայ* (Յուդա) *սկարիովտացի* (իսկարիովտացի) որ եւ *մատնեացիւկ* (մատնեացն) զնա.

Evangelium Matthaei Armenice. Cap. I, verso 196, recto 197, and verso 197; the text is taken from Pavia MS 347 recto/verso 75:

Աւետարան ըստ մաթէոսի.

գիրք *ծնընդեան* (ծննդեանն) յուսի քրիստոսի *որդոյ* (որդւոյ) դաւթի. *որդոյ* Աբրահամոinvertedւ (corrected on folio verso 215 to Աբրահամու). Աբրահամ *ծրնտ* (ծնաւ) զիսահակ. իսահակ ծնաւ զյակովբ. իակովբ ծնաւ *զյուդայ* (զյուդա) եւ զեղբարս Նորա. *յուդայ* ծնաւ զփարէս եւ *զզարայ* (զզարա) ի թամարայ. փարէս ծնաւ զեզրովն. եզրովն ծնաւ զարամ. Արամ ծնաւ զամինադաբ. ամինադաբ ծնաւ *զնայասովն* (զնաասովն). *Նայասովն* ծնաւ *զսաղմոն* (զսաղմովն). *սաղմոն* ծնաւ զբոոս ի *Հռէգէբայ* (Հռագաբայ). բոոս ծնաւ *զյովբէթ* (զյովբէդ) ի Հռութայ. *յովբէթ* ծնաւ զյեսսէ. յեսսէ ծնաւ զդաւիթ արքայ. դաւիթդ ծնաւ *զսաղովմոն* (զսողոմովն) ի կնոջէն ուրիայ. *աinvertedյաղովմոն* ծնաւ զրոբովամ. րոբովամ ծնաւ զաբիայ. Աբիայ ծնաւ զասափ. Ասափ ծնաւ զյովսափատ. յովսափատ ծնաւ զյովրամ. յովրամ ծնաւ *զյովգիաinvertedս* (զյովգիա). *ոզիայ* ծնաւ զյովաթամ. յովաթամ ծնաւ զաքազ. Աքազ ծնաւ

զեզեկիայ (զեզեկիա). *էզեկիայ* ծնաւ գմանասէ. մանասէ ծնաւ զամովս. Ամովս ծնաւ *գյովսիայ* (գյովսիա). *յովսիայ* ծնաւ *զեքոնիայ* եւ զեղբարս նորա. () առ *գերութեՆԷՆ* (գերութեամբն) *բաբելացիոց* (բաբելացւոց). (:) Յետ *գերութեՆԷՆ* (գերութեանն) *բաբելացիոց* ծնաւ *յեքոնիայ* զսաղաթիէլ. սաղաթիէլ ծնաւ զզորաբաբէլ. զորաբաբէլ ծնաւ զաբիուդ. Աբիուդ ծնաւ *զեղիայկիմ* (զեղիակիմ). եղիակիմ ծնաւ զազովր. ազովր ծնաւ զսա(inverted)դովկ. ս(inverted)ադովկ ծնաւ զաքին. Աքին ծնաւ *զելիուդ* (զեղիուդ). *ելիուդ* ծնաւ *զելիազար* (զեղիազար). *ելիազար* ծներ(sic)ւ զմատթան. մատթան ծնաւ զյակովբ. *իակովբ* ծնաւ զյովսէփի զայրն մարեմայ. որում *իաւսեչեալ* (իոսեչեալ) զմարիամ կոյս յորմէ *ծրՆաւ Ն* (ծնաւ) յեսուս որ անուանեցաւ քրիստոս. (:) Արդ *առ* (ամենայն) ազգն յաբրահամէ մինչեւ ի *գատիթ* (sic) (դաւիթ) ազգ.ք չորե.ք պասան.ք. եւ ի *գաւթէ* (sic) (դաւիթէ). մինչեւ ի *գերութեիՆ* (sic) *բաբելացիոց* (գերութիւՆն բաբելացւոց). ազգ.ք չորե.ք պասան.ք. եւ ի գերութեՆԷՆ *բաբելացիոց* մինչեւ (sic) ի քրիստոս ազգ.ք չորե.ք պասան.ք.

---

2. The text of Luke, Chapter 1 found in Ambrogio's *Introductio...* verso 189; the text is taken from Pavia MS 347 verso 71-recto 73:

ի աւետարան ըստ գղուկաս. ա.

Մեծացուսցէ անձն իմ զտէ՜ր եւ ցնծացաւ Հոգի իմ յա՜ծ *փրկիչիմ* (փրկիչ իմ) զի Հայեցաւ ի *իոՆարՀութ՜ի* (իոՆարՀութիւն) աղախնոյ իւրոյ. զի *աՀայ այասՀետէ երաՆիցէն իՆծ ա՜մազգ.ք* (աՀա յայսմ Հետէ երանեսցեն իՆծ ամենայն ազգ.ք). զի արար իՆծ Մեծամեծս *Հզաւրն* (Հզորն): եւ *ա՜քէ* (սուրբ է) անուն Նորա. եւ *ողորմութ՜ի Նառ* (Նորա) ազգաց յազգս երկիւղածաց իւրոց: արար *զաւրութ՜ի* բազկաւ իւրով: ցրուեաց *զամպարտաւաՆս*

(զամբարտաւանս) *Մատւ̣ք* սրտիզ իւրեանզ: քակեաց *զ՟հզաւրս* յաթոռող. և բարձրացոյզ գխոնարհս (:) զքաղզեաւ̣ս լզոյզ բարու̣թ՟ք և զմեծատու̣ս արձա(inverted)կեաց ու̣նայնս: պաշտպանեաց իլ̣~ի ծառայի *իւ̣րոյ* (իւ̣րու̣մ). *յիշելով* *զողորմու̣թ~ի* *իւ̣ր* (յիշել զողորմու̣թիւ̣նս) (:) որպես *խաւ̣սեզաւ* առ Հարս մեր Աբրահամու̣ և զաւ̣ակի Նորա յաւ̣իտեան.

The following is added which is a common Catholic refrain to the liturgical use of the *Magnificat*:; see the Latin translation; the spelling of 'long o' and the clear 'l' in alleluya shows that it is taken from Pavia MS 346:

Դքշխոյ երկնի բերկրեալ ա(inverted)լ̣ելու̣իա. վասն զի զոր արժանի եղերք առնալ ալ̣ելու̣իա. արդ Համբարձաւ որպես ասազն ալ̣ելու̣իա. աղoթեա վասն մեր զածու̣ծոյ ալ̣ելու̣իա.

Regina coeli laetare alleluya, Propterea quia quem meruisti portare alleluya. Nunc resurrexit sicut dixit alleluya. ora pro nobis deum alleluya. (Folio 190r)

3. The Introit from the Mass for St. Ambrose (already introduced above): Pavia MS 346 folio verso 140:

1. (Folio recto 152) Vel etiam sine affixo pronomine ut si Divi Ambro (Ambrose of Milan) sit orationem Arminice his verbis dixeris. This is from Pavia MS 346; see *Missale Romano*, 1946 p. 1313. The feast of Saint Ambrose is Dec. 7. In the following transcription, the third line is according to the Meillet system:

Ա~ծ որ ժողովրդեան քու̣մ յաւ̣իտենական
Astuzt or zogl   rdean chum iauitenacan
Ac' (abbreviation) or zhoghovrdean k'um yawitenakan
Deus qui populo tuo aeternae
փրկու̣թ~ե զերանելին Ամբրոսիոս սպասաւ̣որ

phercuthene zeranelin Ambrosios spasauor

p'rkut'e (abbreviation) zeranelin Ambrosios spasawor

salutis beatum Ambrosium ministrum

Հատուցեր պարգևեա աղաչեմՔ զի զոր

hatuzter pargeuea aglazemch zi zor

hatuc'er pargewea aghach'emk' zi zor

tribuisti, praesta quaesumus ut quem

վարդապետ կենաց ունեաՔ ի յերկրի.

vardapet cenazt vneach i iercri

vardapet kenac' uneak' i yerkri

doctorem vitae habuimus in terris

բարեխոս ունել արժանասցուՔ ի յերկինս.

barehhos vnel arxanaszzuch i iercins.

barexos unel arzhanasc'uk' i yerkins.

intercessorem habere mereamur in coelis [sic?].

Note that this text is found in MS 346 folio verso 140 and that the text there has all of the errors found in Ambrogio: the most surprising is the doubling of the prepostion 'i' in 'i yerkins' and 'i yerkri.' This is found throughout the manuscript.

From `Missale Romano' ed. 1946: Liber Usualis Missa et Officii page 1313
Oratio Dec. 7: Deus, qui populo tuo aeternae salutis beatum Ambrosium ministrum tribuisti: praesta, quesumus; ut quem doctorem vitae habuimus in terris, intercessorem habere mereamur in coelia (sic?). P.C.D.N.

4. My next item is a version of the 'Ave Maria' found in his exercise section. The Armenian Apostolic Church does not commonly include this Medieval 'Dominican' Catholic prayer in its liturgy. Note that this prayer is woven into theLiturgy of the first two Sundays of Advent found in MS 346, Folios 18 (23)- 22 (27) Լուր Մարիամ կուսդ Քի~.... It is obviously built on Luke 1: 28-35: Ուրախ լեր, բերկրեալդ, Տէր ընդ քեզ: և Նա ընդ բանն խոսվեցաւ, և խորհեր ընդ միտս թե որպիսի՝ ինչ

իցէ ողջոյնա այս: ... Մի՛ երկնչիր, Մարիամ, զի գտեր շնորհս յԱստուծոյ: Եւ աՀա յղասջիր և ծնցես որդի, և կոչեցես զանուն նորա Յսուս: Նա եղիցի մեծ, և Որդի Բարձրելոյ կոչեսցի: (Folio recto 186)

Salutatio Angelica:

Long o rather than aw is characteristic of Pavia MS 346 (The prayer as here up until the words 'orovayn k'o' is found on folio recto 217):

ուրախլեր Մարիամ. լի շնորՀօ.ք տեար
Vrahhler Mariam. li snorhoch tear
uraxler mariam. li shnorho(long)k' tear
Letare Maria. plena gratia dominus

ընդ.քեզ.   օրՀնեալ ես դու ի կանայս. և
iendchez.   rhneal es du i canais. eu
e(schwa)ndk'ez. o(long)rhneal es du i kanays. ew
tecum. benedicta es tu in mulieribus. et

աւրՀնեալ է պտուղ որովայն .քո. տեար
aurhneal æ ptugl or   ain cho. tear
awrhneal e(long) ptugh orovayn k'o. tear
benedictus est fructus ventris tui. dominus

Մեր իեսուս քրիստոս. սրբուՀի աստուծածին
mer Iesus Christos. Srbuhi astuxaxin
mer iesus k'ristos. srbuhi astucacin
noster Iesus Christos. Sancta dei genitrix

միշտ կոյս Մարիամ. Աղօթեա վասն մեր
mist cois Mariam. Aglothea vasn mer
misht koys mariam. Agho(long)t'ea vasn mer
semper virgo Maria. Ora pro nobis

զՄելաւոր.քս (Մեղաւոր.քս) այժմ և ի ժաՌ զՄաՀու
zmelauorchs aizm eu i zamn zmahu

zmelawork's ayzhm ew i zhamn zmahu

peccatoribus nunc et in hora mortis

Մերում. ԱՄԷՆ.

merum. Amen.

merum. Amen.

nostrae. Amen.

There are a number of texts of this prayer handwritten into the empty pages of Ambrogio's Armenian manuscript MS 346. One includes Armenian musical notation. The following is the canonical translation found among the Mechitarians:

From <<Փոքրիկ Հաղորդասէրը>> (patrastec' H. Yakob V. C'ant'ayean), Venice: Tparan S. Ghazaru, 1952, (no pagination on copy):

Ողջոյն քեզ, Մարիամ, լի շնորհօք, Տէր ընդ քեզ, օրՀնեալ ես դու ի կանայս և օրՀնեալ է պտուղ որովայնի քոյ Յիսուս: ՍրբուՀի Մարիամ, մայր Աստուծոյ, պարեխօսեա վասն մեր մեղաւորացս, այժմ և ի ժամու մաՀուան մերոյ. ամէն:

The inside cover of MS 346 has the following version of the prayer. The page is water damaged and the text is heavily superscribed with traditional Armenian musical diacritics; however, it can be completed as it is a copy of the text on folio recto 221 MS 346 (the first lines of this up to 'i k'anays' is also found on folios recto 139 & verso 197 of MS 346):

Ողջ Լեր , Մարիամ, լի շնորհօք, Տէր ընդ քեզ, աւրՀնեալ ես դու ի կանայս և օրՀնեալ է պտուղ քո որովայնի:

Երջանիկ իսկ ես սուրբ կոյս Մարիամ, և ամենայն գով... The remainder is very difficult to discern due to water damage to the paper, but I continue from the original within the text: գովեստից արժանաւոր վ՞ն զի ի քէն ծագեցաւ արեգակն արդարութե՞ քս՞ աճ՞ մեր:

There is a strange mixture of wording here that reminds one of the text in the *Introductio...* and the text of the traditional Catholic Armenian version found among the Mechitarians; we must remember that MS 346 is a translation by a Catholic Armenian Dominican and devotion to the Virgin and the actual development of the 'Ave Maria' is thought to be St. Dominic's primary focus and the focus of his order subsequently.

5. Ambrogio verso 191; The Apostles Creed: the text is taken from Pavia MS 346 folio recto 45; the Catholic Creed would normally be found in such a book and the orthography agrees with that manuscript rather than with MS 347. Note also that the spelling of the name Pontius Pilatus shows the influence of the Latin clear `l' rather than the more normal Armenian spelling with the guttural. This tendency continued as Western names were adopted into Armenian.

The English version is (as I remember): I believe in God the Father Almighty creator of heaven and earth, and Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. He was judged by Pontius Pilate, crucified, died and was buried. He descended into Hell and on the third day rose from the dead. He ascended into heaven. He sits at the right hand of the Father Almighty. He will come again to judge the living and the dead. I believe in the Holy Spirit, in the holy Catholic Church, in Communion of Saints, in the remission of sins, in the resurrection of the body and in the life eternal. Amen.

Latin: Credo in Deum patrem omnipotentem creatorem coeli & terrae. Et in Iesum Christum filium eius vnigenitum dominum nostrum. Qui conceptus est de spiritu sancto natus ex Maria virgine. Passus sub Pontio Pilato Crucifixus mortuus & sepultus. Descendit ad inferos in tertia die resurrexit a mortuis. Ascendit in coelos. Sedet ad dexteram patris omnipotentis. Inde venturus est iudicare viuos & mortuos. Credo in sanctum spiritum. In sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam. In sanctorum communionem. In remissionem peccatorum. In corporum resurrectionem. In vitam aeternam. Amen.

Armenian: Հաւատնէ զԱնա քելլոգն. Հաւատամի (sic) յա~ծ Հայրն ամէնակարող սպեղծողն երկնի և երկրի. և ի յսոս քրիստոս

յորդի նորա միածին ի տեառն մեր. որ յղացաւ ի Հոգոյն սուրբոյ ծնեալ ի Մարիամա կուսեն. չարչարեալ ընդ Պոնտացոյ Պիլատոսիւ խաչեցեալ մեռեալ և թաղեալ. էջ ի դժոխս Յերրորդ յաւուր յարեաւ ի մեռելոց. ել ի յերկինս. Նստի ընդ աջմէ Հօր ամենակարողի. Անտի գալոցէ դատել զկենդանիս և զմեռեալս. Հաւատամ ի սուրբոյն (sic) Հոգին. ի սուրբուհի եկեղեցի կաթոլիկէ. ի *առբոցն* (sic miscorrected on folio 215 to սուրբոցն rather than the correct սրբոցն) Հաղորդութաին. ի թողութաին *մեղաց* (sic corrected on folio 215 to մեղաց). ի մարմնոց յարութին. իկեանն (sic) յաւիտենականս. Ամէն.

The text found in Pavia MS 346 Folio recto 45:

Ճաւատամ ի յա~ծ Հայրն ամենակարող ապեղծօղն երկնի և երկրի: Եւ ի յս~ քս~ յորդի նր~ միածին ի տր~ն մեր: Որ յղացաւ ի Հոգոյն սրբոյ ծնեալ ի Մարիամա կուս են. Չարչարեալ ընդ Պոնտացով Պիլատոսիւ խաչեցեալ մեռեալ և թաղեալ: էջ ի դժոխս: Յերրորդ յաւուր յարեաւ ի մեռելոց: Եւ ի յերկինս: Նստի ընդ աջմէ Հօր ամ~կղի: Անտի գալոցէ դատել զկենդանիս և զմեռեալս: Հաւատամ ի սբ~ Հոգին: ի սրբուհի եկեղեցի կաթոլիկէ: ի սրբոցն Հաղորդուիթ~ն.: ի թողուիթ~ն մեղաց: ի մարմնոց յարութի~ն պ~տ ի կեանն յաւիտենականս: Ամէն:

There are obviously many mistakes in the entire -t'iwn declension or possible strong dialectal influence (perhaps nasalization). The translation is in an Armenian Catholic Missal/Breviary of the 14th century from the Kafa colony.

This Creed is not the one adopted by the Armenian Apostolic Church and has quite a separate history within the Roman Catholic Church and the Roman World (see Burn pp. 221-240) .

Part III: Ambrogio's Remaining Short Armenian Citations: These will also appear in their Latin transcription as found in the text.

Verso 16 **The Armenian Vowels**

All of the Armenian citations in the texts will be commented upon where necessary. If Ambrogio's transcription differs from the Classical, or from the Eastern or Western dialect, it will be noted. Phonetic realization will be in // and my transcription will be in a modified version of the Meillet-REA system.

The first letter **այբ** `aip' (Western pronunciation) `ayb' (Eastern pronunciation and Classical transliteration), **Ա, ա,** he connects these with the Semitic aleph of every variant.

Ambrogio will include in the category vowel any Semitic letter found in a name that is subsequently transliterated as a vowel in that name's rendition in Greek, Armenian, Latin, Old Church Slavic, etc. See further comments with tables on folios 143-144. The example is **Աբրահամ** 'Abraham' (the Eastern pronunciation and classical transliteration); the Western dialect would pronounce this name `Apraham.'

The fifth letter is **ե** iech. Tne pronunciation of this letter's name would seem to be /jek^h/ if we follow the canons set out by Ambrogio himself, but the actual Armenian name is closer to the pronunciation, /jetsh/ and this allows us to speculate that Ambrogio himself allowed the digraph 'ch' to have at least two values: /k^h/ and /tsh/.

The transliteration 'hhezron' of **եզրովն** seems to be the typographer's mistaken repetition of the transliteration of the following Syriac, which indeed is properly transliterated with initial hard breathing.

է 'æ' is a strange transliteration for this letter usually transcribed as 'long e.' The example does not actually use this at all: **ովբէթ** 'ovbeth' does not distinguish the quality of the 'e.'

ը 'iet' is another odd form given that it ignores the normal `schwa' like quality of the vowel. This vowel would have been particularly difficult to give an Italian equivalent and Ambrogio compares it with Macedonian vowels, which can be close.

Recto 17

The example ըստ Մաթէոսի 'iest Matheosi' reminds us that a pronunciation closer to 'i' is not unkown in Armenian dialects: Agulis shows a wide range of reflexes (Greppin, 1986).

ի 'ini' is not very controversial and its example is equally commonplace Իսահակ 'Isahach' although the aspiration of the final 'k' in the transliteration causes problems.

խ `che vel hhe' is a very odd candidate for a vowel indeed, except that modern phoneticians often class 'h' and its rougher cousins as voiceless vowels. Again the value of 'ch' is very much muddied as it has been used for three Armenian phones/phonemes on these two pages alone. The example is Իաւնեցեալ 'hhausezeal.'

Հ 'ho' is also considered a vowel and its example is a repitition of 'Abraham.'

ձ 'ie, hie,and gie' give a wide range of conflicting values for this letter. The examples all reflect the last value: ձերվագի 'geruazi' (the early typographers did not distinguish between v/u),

Verso 17

վիձիլիա 'vigilia' is a transliteration of a Latin word from Pavia MS 346 and is written with a definitely `Western Armenian' phonology, and կարիձին 'charigin' scorpion is incorrectly declined in an oblique form with a deictic particle (it should read կարձին 'chargin' with the loss of the unstressed 'i' in the genitive and shows the Western pronunciation of ձ although the initial consonant is voiceless as in the Eastern dialects and it is again unexpectedly aspirated.

The last example ՃԷրոնիմոս 'Hieronymos' is usually transliterated with an initial 'ho' as 'Heronimos.' (See the 'Nor Bargirk'). The supposed example with this initial letter justifies the second value given it and comes from the same MS 346.

Յ and յ (this letter is one of the few in the font with a capital variant) 'i' has the value /j/ and can be a consonant or a part of a diphthong; however, Ambrogio does not know its Medieval and modern initial pronunciation as aspiration. He transliterates Յակովբ 'Iacob' and յովրան 'ioram' (although he has incorrectly written 'ioran' in the Armenian) as these were pronounced in the 5th century and are sometimes pronounced in Agulis and other dialects (Greppin, 1986; Jahukyan, 1972; Acharyan, 1952).

Ո 'vuo vel vua' (with the normal homorganic 'v' in intial position) is illustrated by բոոս 'Boos.'

Վ 'vief, vieu vel viech' has a lengthening effect on 'vuo' which it follows and replicates the Greek 'Omega.' He credits this insight to Postel.

Recto 18:

 Thus, our previously noted `Iacob and Ioram' could also be transliterated `Iacoub and Iouram.' In this way the Armenian has Յովսէփ 'Iouseph.'

Verso 18:

Ւ 'yun vel iun' is clearly derived from Greek Ypsilon. It can have a consonantal and a vocalic pronunciation: Դաւիթ 'Dauith,' Եւսեբիոս 'Eusebios' or աւգուստոս Augustos. When added to 'vuo' it creates 'u' as in Greek: իուդայ ծնաւ զփարս եւ զզարայ ի թամարայ 'Iudai csnau zPhares eu zZarai i Thamarai.' (Note the misuse of 'i' for proper 'y' in 'Iudai.') When it is added to ա 'ayp' it creates a diphthong that can also be written with the 'long o': Աւգուստինոս Augustinos or Օգուստինոս Ogustinos.

Recto 19:

Aypyun has the same theological value as the AlphaOmega of the Greek.

Verso 38:

Matthew 27, 46; Mark 15, 34: ԷԼԻ (էղի) ԷԼԻ (էղի) ԼԱՄԱ (ղամա) ՍԱԲԱՔԹԱՆ inverted ՆԻ 'eli eli lama sabachthani': note that the aspirated 'k' is given the value 'ch.' The Matthew text is found in Pavia MS 347 Folio recto 5.

The Lectionary from Kaffa may have been influenced by the Vulgate pronunciation of the quoted Aramaic as the received text has the normal 'guttural l' used to transliterate Greek words.

Psalm 22 (21), 1: ԱՍՏՈՒԾ (Աստուած) ԱՍՏՈՒԾ (Աստուած) ԻՄ ՆԱԵԱՑ ԱՌ ԻՍ ԸՆԴԵՐ (ընդեր) ԹՈՂԵՐ ԶԻՍ 'Astuz Astuz im naieaz arh is iendier tholier zis.' (the text is from Pavia MS 346; the pronunciation of the word for God is Ambrogio's interpretation of the abbreviation and it is not Grabar, but the colloquial): note the 'i' in 'naieaz' that suggests that Ambrogio's transliteration is something more than a faithful literal record (although 'ie' normally transcribes �|, it is also an alternate transcription for Է; the Oskanean Bible of 1666 has ՆԱՅԵԱՑ); also note that the strengthened 'r' is marked with aspiration (a feature found in Meghri dialect if this serves as a mark of voicelessness) (Greppin, p. 117). Note that the Zohrabian text is included in the parentheses.

The transcription of the guttural 'l' in 'tholier' as a clear 'l' is probably a typographer's error; Ambrogio regularly uses 'gl' to transcribe this sound and this should be read as a 'g' plus an 'l' not as the Italian digraph for a palatal 'l.'

The context of the Armenian quotation is quite interesting. Recto 38 is entitled as an ostensible discussion of the consonants of the Indic or Ethiopic Alphabet, yet like much of Ambrogio's book it begins with a long excursus (the preceding chapter on the Greek

Consonants ended with a three folio long detailed discussion of the construction and materials of his uncle Afranius' new musical instrument the phagotus). The excursus discusses comparatively the text of the Bishop of Nebbio's Chaldaic Psalter, which contained an Arabic translation, which appears in Karshuni in Ambrogio. Thus the text of Psalm 22 (21) is compared with its variants in the Indic (Ge'ez), Hebrew, Arabic (Karshuni), Armenian, Greek, Macedonian, and Dalmatian, either from the Psalm or from its quotation in Matthew or Mark on the lips of the crucified Jesus.

The breadth of his references are best understood by a quotation of all of the transcribed texts (only the Syriac, Armenian, Greek and Hebrew are also in their original alphabets). The purpose here is to examine the apparent disagreement between the texts of different traditions of translation. He divides the material into two sets: 1. Those having the addition of the phrase 'respice me' 'Look at me; attend me' to the words of the Psalm; 2. Those traditions lacking those words. He has clearly set out two distinct textual traditions and is among the first scholars to realize the inherent lability of the translated texts of the Bible. Surprisingly he does not note from his Lectionary the Armenian interpretation of Jesus words in Matthew found just below his quoted Aramaic: Աստուած իմ Աստուած իմ ընդէր թողեր զիս. (Pavia MS 347, Folio recto 5) He would have then displayed that the two traditions were complicatedly intertwined even as they are in the Vulgate text itself.

Psalm 22:   Ge'ez: Amlachia, amlachia: nazorani, vualmont: hhadagani:
             Arabic (intepretation of Jesus' Aramaic): Alhai Alhai antar ali,
                  lmada ia alhai tractni.
             Greek (interpretation of Jesus' Aramaic): Ho theos, ho theos mu,
                  prosches mi, ina ti encatelipes me. This text with 'prosches
                  mi' is not found in our modern text and is from the
                  Septuagint Psalms
             Latin: Deus, Deus meus, respice in me, quare me dereliquisti?
             Armenian: Astuz Astuz im naieaz arh is iendier tholier zis.
             Macedonian: Boge Boge moi vienmimi, viescuiu ostauime.
             Dalmatian: Boge Boge moi vanmimi vschuiu me ostaui.

Hebrew: Eli, Eli, lamma azauthani.

Syriac: alohi, alohi lmono sbachthoni.

Chaldaic (Aramaic in Hebrew letters mistransliterated): eli eli
matul ma (sic: matul ham) scbaqtani.

Arabic (Karshuni): alhai alhai lmadi tractni.

Armenian (Matthew): eli eli lama sabachthani

Greek (Matthew): hili hili lama sabchthani (sic: mistransliterated:
text has 'sabachthani'). The actual present Greek text of
New Testament has the following: eloi eloi lema
sabchthani, but it notes Ambrogio's as a rejected reading;
however, without initial aspiration.

Greek (Mark): eloi eloi lama sabachthani.

The texts display the various traditions originating in a Greek world and those originating in a Semitic tradition, knowing the Hebrew. Although St. Jerome translated from the Hebrew, he kept the Old Latin (Greek based) text of the Psalms; moreover, although the Peshitta usually followed the Greek text, the Syriac Psalms are heavily influenced by Targum and Hebrew texts. Thus we can see a clear division of the textual traditions, with Jesus' cry clearly representing the Targum. (Metzger, 1977)

The Ge'ez material is from Potken's Psalter, whose arguments with Ambrogio over the identity of Ge'ez as the true Chaldaic were famous among scholars, see especially Postel. (1538)

When he finally returns to the Indic letters (he has no font for the alphabet unlike Postel and Potken), his discussion clearly assumes the genetic relations between the Semitic languages Hebrew, Syriac (Chaldaic), Arabic, and Indic (Ge'ez). The same relations are more clearly stated by Postel (1538, folio 23) in his short description of Indic.

Verso 51:

Առ գետս բաբելացոց 'Arh giets babielazoz' (Psalm 137:1) The Armenian is incorrect as the Zohrabian text reads Բաբելացւոց 'Babelac'woc'.' Note that the form 'giets' ignores the normal pronunciation գետրս.

Verso 56:

Պատարագս ոսկի և կնդուկ և զմուռս Patarags osci ieu cnduc ieu zmurhs. (Matt. 2, 11 The mistakes in the text are all found in Codex 347 recto 24) Note that the consonantal pronunciation of the initial 'o' is not written and 'cnduc' should read 'cndruc.' Zohrabian text: Պատարագս ոսկի և կնդրուկ և զմուս:

Recto 57:

The Armenian is provided in the context of a discussion of the Macedonian alphabet's letter 'k;' Psalm 119 (120) is cited for its use of the word կեդարու 'ciedaru,' which is found with an initial letter 'k' or 'c' in the Armenian, Greek, Latin, Dalmatian, and Macedonian translations. The word is an ethnonym, Kedar.

Recto 60:

մաննա [inverted] manna; note that the letter ayp inverted is used as a common abbreviation for the oft repeated word 'all' throughout the Lectionary, MS 347. Thus, a common error in the setting of Ambrogio's fonts could be influenced by its use in his manuscript exemplars.

Verso 71:

Ահա լուաք զրնմանէ յեփրաթա 'Ahha luach zienmane iiephratha.' (Psalm 132) This transliteration shows extra aspiration for the first word, yet establishes a clear marker for aspirated voiceless stops with the digraphs, 'ch,' 'ph,' and 'th.' The Zohrabian has զնմանէ.

Verso 72:

սաղ ⅃՛ոս 'salmos' He notes the loss of the initial 'p;' also note the use of a clear 'l' to transcribe the guttural.

Verso 122:

ծաղ ㇵ 'Tzadæ vel Zzadæ' is from the names of the Hebrew alphabet found on verso folio 144. The list is from Pavia MS 178 folio 5. His usual name for this Hebrew letter is Zadech or Zadik although 's'adhe' is the modern name for the letter. The Armenian name is far closer to the Syriac name, Zode, and all of this is part of Ambrogio's argument for the greater antiquity of the Chaldaean over the present Hebrew alphabet. However, it is more interesting to note the various digraphs that Ambrogio uses to represent the Armenian letters; it is clear that he is intending a voiceless affricate.

We should also note that in the numerical use of the various alphabets, the Semitic order and values are kept in the Greek with the exception of this letter; it is missing from the Greek repertoire except as a numerical addition used only in counting. Often a mystery for Ambrogio entails the numerical value more than the phonetic. (Gamkrelidze; Ambrogio, folios 133-135)

Verso 142-Recto 144 is already part of the text.

Verso 144:

A list of the Hebrew alphabetical names from Pavia MS 178. In two cases, the 'shin' and the 'samkath,' the printer uses unique type faces to more closely emulate the actual manuscript appearance of the capital letters of the words on the list (Ambrogio's font had only three infrequently used capitals, **Ա, Յ, Պ**): see below. Ambrogio thinks that the list comes from Porphyry's commentaries on Aristotle (which is bound together with the manuscript of these

names and a list of Hebrew names and their explanations probably from Philo): Ալեփ aleph ('aleph), բէթ beth (beth), գամէլ Gamel (gimel although gaml is an ancient form), դաղեթ Dagleth (daleth), Հէ hæ (he), վաւ Vau (waw), Զէ ze (zayin), խէթ hhet (h'eth), տէթ teth (t'eth), Յովտ iot (yodh), քապ chap (Copied from manuscript; normal value, kaph), ղամեդ glamed (lamedh), մեմ mem (mem), նուն nun (nun), ա[printed as an Omega, which more closely resembles the manuscript's capital Մ]ամքապ samchath (samekh), էg iez ('ayin; the name given here for this letter is very puzzling), փէ phæ (pe), ծադէ zzadæ (s'adhe), կոփ quoph (qoph), րէշ res (resh), շ[strangely misshapen form of the letter is used here differing from the one immediately before; it resembles the shape of the '2' found on folio12, MS 178]ին sin (shin), թայ thai (taw). These are named the բառք եբրայեցւոց 'barhch iebraiezuoz' and the names given do not square with a number of the present names of the alphabet (given in parentheses), yet names are subject to change over time and Ambrogio is quite sure of this list's antiquity.

Note the frequent lapses in transcription: t for th or p for b; are we seeing the interference of the ear upon the eye?

Recto 145:

Ambrogio displays his range of knowledge of the possible pronunciations of the Armenian 'k': Ադամ 'Adam,' երկիր 'ercir, երկիր կոյս 'ergir cois,' երկիր մարմնացեալ erkir marmnazzeal,' երկիր կարմիր erqir carmir,' and կամ որ յ երկրէ ամենայնքո 'cuam or i ercræ amenaincho.' He has incorrectly combined the last two words 'amenain cho' and incorrectly divided 'iercræ.' He finishes this bravura demonstration with a quotation from St. Paul, 1 Corinthians 15, 22: որպէս ադամաւն ամենեքեան մեռանին նոյնպէս և ի քս՟ ամենեքեան կենդանասցին 'Orpes adamaun amenechean (amenechin) meranin noinpæs eu i christos (christosiu) amenechean (amenechin) cendanasztin.' (This passage is no longer found in MS 347, which has a number of lost folios). We note the confusion of 'e' and 'æ' for the same letter and the misprint of -yn for -in in the last Armenian word. It is also evident that Ambrogio was not taking advantage of the Italian colloquial pronunciation of 'c' before 'e' as an affricate;

it is possible to assume that his different transcriptions for the one letter are attempts to realize the varying pronunciations of native speakers (belonging to various dialect communities). Differences from the standard Biblical text are contained in parentheses.

Verso 145:

A list of Hebrew names that is taken from MS 178 folios 5-10: Աբէլ Abel, Աբիուդ Abiud, Աբիսաք Abisach, Ասափ Asaph, Ադովնայ Adounai, Անանիա Anania, Ազարիա Azaria, Արիէլ Ariel, Ադոնիաս Adonias, Արամ Aram, Ամոս Amos, Ամինադաբ Aminadab, Ագար Agar, Ագգագ Aggag, Աքազ Achaz. The last is illustrated by a quotation from Isaiah 7, 10-12 (Ambrogio refers to Isaiah 71, but there are not that many chapters in Isaiah): Եւ յաւել տեար (տէր) իաւսել ընդ աքազդու եասէ (և ասէ) իՆդրեայ (իՆդրեա) դու քեզ ՆշաՆ ի տՆէ˜ (տէ˜) այ˜ քումմէ ի խորութէ˜ կամ ի բարձրութէ˜. և ասէ Աքազ ոչ իՆդրեցից և ոչ փորձեցից գտր˜. 'eu iauel thear (Tær) hhausel iend achazu eu asæ hhendreai (xndrea) du chez nsan i tearnæ astuchzzai (corrected in emendations Folio recto 215 to 'astuzzai,' yet the Biblical text reads, 'astucoy') chummæ i hhoruthene (xoruthean) cam i bartzruthene (barjruthean) eu asæ achaz oz hhndrezzizt eu oz phorxezzizt ztear.' The passage comes from MS 347 but the page has evidently been torn out as have so many: see the appendix listing all Biblical passages still extant in the Lectionary.

This passage is full of surprises. The word 'Tær' is given its Medieval form 'tear' and even the initial 't' is written 'th.' The initial 'o' is not written 'vuo' although that pronunciation has been noted. Note that there is lack of initial homorganic development of 'o' in the Agulis and Meghri dialects (Greppin, p. 117). The transliteration 'z' in 'oz' /votsh^h/ is hardly satisfactory, but neither are the 'tz' and 'x' proper transliterations of /dz/; however that phoneme could have different allophonic realizations between resonants and when following one. Finally, notice the weak nature of the sibbilation in 'nsan' and the helping vowel in 'hhendreai.'

Recto 146:

The text from Isaiah 7, 14 continues: ԱՀա կոյս (կոյսն) յղասցի և ծնցի որդի և կոչեսցեն զանուն Նորա էմմանուէլ 'Aha (not Ahha as before) cois iglaszzi eu tzanzti ordi eu cozeszten zanun nora emmanuæl.' We have only to note that another helping vowel has been added to 'tzanzti' and that it is now an 'a'; also, the distinction between /ts/ and /ts^h/ is not the point of articulation so that writing 'tz' and 'zt' does not adequately represent their components of affrication. Lastly, the spelling of 'emmanuæl' does not transliterate the Armenian.

We proceed to Luke 16, 24 and the tale of the rich man and Lazarus: Հայր Աբրահամ ողորմեաց ինձ. և առաքեայ (առաքեա) զղազարոս զիթացցէ (զի թացցէ) զծերն (զծագ) մատյն (մատին) իւրոյ ի ջուր և զովացուսցէ զլեզու իմ. զի ափափակիմ (պապակիմ) իտապոյ (ի տապոյ) աստի. 'Hair Abraham oglormeazt intz, eu aracheai (arrak^{h}ea) zglazaros zi thaztzzæ ztzærn (ztsag) matin (misspelled -yn) ifroi (iwroy) ischur (i djur) eu zouaztuszzæ zlezu im (zi [in manuscript]) aphaphakim (papakim) itapoi (i tapoy) asti.'

There is much to detain us here. Two strange words enter the text from Ambrogio's source MS 347 (Folio verso 113): mispelled 'tzærn' 'hand' replaces /tsag/ 'tip' for obvious semantic reasons (hands and fingers go together naturally). but the replacing of 'papakim' by 'aphaphakim' seems simply the result of scribal play with a word no longer understood. The trigraph 'sch' is of uncertain value and seems to arise from Ambrogio's increasing frustration with the Armenian fricatives and affricates.

At the end of this page, Ambrogio begins an investigation into the Armenian negative: անուն 'anun' and աննանուն 'ananun.'

Verso 146:

որոշելի/աnորոշելի   'orosceli   vel   anorosceli'; աnջատականք/աnանջատականք 'anscatacanch vel ananscatacanch.' These are taken from his manuscript of Porphyry. Ambrogio wrongly opines that the 'n' can be lost

and words can be negated with the 'a' alone: աանջատական_քն 'aanscatacanch.' He may have run into this as a scribal error or in too Hellenized Philhellene texts (he had the early translations of Aristotle in   MS 178).   He also speculates on metatheses such as Ատրիդես/Արտիդես Atrides/Artides.

Note the use of 'sc' for the /sh/ and for /dj/.

Recto 147:

From Porphyry, ողջե 'olze' անողջե 'anolze' and ոչ նողջե (note the misspelling) 'oz nolze' This last has become infected with a mobile 'n' ultimately drived from the 'definite article.'   The text should read 'ozn olze,' but Ambrogio speculates on the origin of the phenomenon and marshalls the odd spellings found in his texts (especially MS 346, which is a 14th century translation of a Roman missal and is replete with literal spellings and phonetic spellings based on the Western dialects, which cannot agree).   բաբելոն 'babelon' and Արգետս բաբելացոց 'Argets babelaztozt' բանէրէգէս 'banerægæs' against the Latin   form   Boanerges.   բարտողիմէոս   'Barthoglimæos'   (traditional)   and բարդոլոմէոս Bardolomæos' (Latinate). The Latin names Albini, Potentianæ, and Silvestrus transliterated as Ալպինի 'Alpini,' բոդենցիանէ 'Bodenztianæ,' and սելբեստրոս 'Selbestros.'   The Medieval sound shift that took place in Anatolian Armenian accounts for these late spellings, and the evidence of the pronunciation of Latin in the 14th century is interesting: -nti- is transliterated -nzti-.

Verso 147:

He notes other variations: The name Blasii appears in its Greek incarnation վլասայ 'Vlasai' and Februarium appears as փետրուար 'Phetruar,' where 'b' seems to have changed into a 't.'

Ambrogio turns then to the 'g' sound or letter: գադ 'gad,' գոմոր 'gomor,' գորդիանոս 'gordianos,' գէորգէոս 'gæorgæos,' գլարեա 'glarea,' գունթինոս

'guinthinos' (he misreads 'gun-' for 'guin'), գրիգորիոս 'grigorios,' գողգոթա 'goglgota' (should be -th-), գաբրիէլ 'gabriel,' and գեննեսարէթ 'gennesareth.' The last item turns his mind to Luke 5, 1 (MS 347 Folio verso 97, which has ծովակին), and the Lake of Gennesareth ակին (ծովակին) գեննեսարէթայ. 'Acim [sic] gennesarethai.' Ambrogio has misread the word division due to the frequent use of 'akn,' 'eye' with the meaning 'spring' or 'pool.' as well.

He ends the page with a reference to գեդէոն 'gedeon,' which he illustrates textually on the next page.

Recto 148:

More names hold his attention: վն˜ գեդէոնի (Գեդէոնի), բարակայ: սամփսոնի, յեփթայեա (Յեփթայեայ) դաւթի, և սամուելի, և այլոց մարգարէիցն. 'Van (Vasn) gedeoni baracai samphsoni iephthaiea dauthi eu samueli eu ailozt margaræiztn.' (Hebrews 11, 32; Pavia MS 347 Folio recto 147) The misreading of the common abbreviation for 'vasn' is most likely a typographical error since he correctly reads it more often. This pasage brings a rumination on the interchangeability of 'g' and 'kʰ': թաքուցանէր 'Thachuztaner, թագուցի 'thaguzzi,' and թագուցաւ 'taguzzau.' (Psalm 118)

These are forms that show a tired scribe's mistakes (although թագնում 'thagnum' is literary), but the next pair have been canonized so that both are accepted literary forms from Psalms 150 and 151: փափագեաց 'phaphageazt and փափաքեաց phaphacheazt.' From Porphyry, արծրունկն 'artzieruncn' compares with արծրունգն գոլ 'artzierungn,' and (John 19, 13; MS 347 Folio verso 28) Latin Gabbata with Armenian կապպաթայ (Կապպաթա) 'cappathai.'

Verso 148:

Ambrogio lists spellings from the names of Christ's disciples and from Biblical names from 3 Kings 9 (1 Kings 9 in the King James Version). The text is now lost from MS 347. The entire discussion on this page is occasioned by the toponym Galilee, for the names in Acts 1, 11 and John 21, 1-3 lead on to a connection with Nathaniel and Tobit 1, 1, which also mentions Galilee, and the cities of the Galilee listed in 1 Kings.

գալիլեացիք 'galileaztich, տիբերեայ 'tibereai,' և նաթանայել որ ի կանա գալիլեացոց 'eu nathanaiel or i cana galilæaztozt,' դան 'dan,' դինա 'dina,' դովթաիմ 'douthaim,' դաթան 'dathan,' դագոն 'dagon,' դանիել 'daniel,' դովեկ 'douech,' դեբովրա 'deboura,' and դեոնեսիոս 'deonesios.'

He continues his survey of the orthographic and phonetic peculiarities of the Armenian consonants of his texts. It should be noted that Ambrogio is fully aware of the inconsistencies created by scribal traditions and that these observations would be equally capable of being made if he were to use a temporally and spatially disparate group of Latin manuscripts. It is the philological hunt itself that is being celebrated here. Ambrogio, however, cannot but dimly grasp the profound phonetic changes that have occurred in the Middle Armenian (Cilician) pronunciation of Grabar texts: he has marshalled all the evidence, but lacks any explanatory framework except that of scribal inconsistency.

Recto 149:

The first name continues the text of John (MS 347, the Lectionary), but the names compared with it are from the Roman Catholic Missal (MS 346), which has a tendency to use Western dialect phonology to transcribe Latin names. Ambrogio is oblivious of the causes for these discrepancies.

The Latin Zebedei is compared with the Armenian զեբեթայ 'Zebethai,' Clement is paired with կլեմենդոս 'Clemendos,' Bartholomei with բարդոլիմեոս 'Bardolimeos,' Antonino has Անդոնինոս 'Andoninos,' Antonio has Անդոնիոս Andonios.'

John 1, 44 brings us to the variants between Latin and Armenian principles of transliteration: Bethsaida yoked with բեդսաիդա (Բէթսաjիդաj) 'Bedsaida' (traditionally spelled 'Bethsayida'), (MS 347 Folios recto 9 and recto 51) and Matthew 21, 1: եկին ի բեդբագէ (Բէթփագէ). 'ecin i bedbagae' with Latin Bethphage (MS 347 Folio recto 59).

He also notes in an aside that this nominal variation is theologically troubling if the psalms of David were intended to be interpretively sung for eternity. This raises the meaning of Hebrew 'selah' and its Greek equivalent 'Diapsalma' which he gives in Armenian transliteration դիափսագլմա 'Diaphsaglma' although it is not found in the Armenian texts of the Psalms; he interprets both as meaning 'eternally' միշտ, yet most modern translations offer 'rest' Հանգիստ as the meaning of the Hebrew (Zohrabian: see Habakkuk 3, 3 & 14, where Հանգիստ is the equivalent of the Septuagint's 'diapsalma').

Ironically, it is this desire to maintain the ancient pronunciation that is driving the orthographic discrepancies he is puzzling over. The Vulgate text and its pronunciation motivated the translator to change the spelling of the traditional text so that the sound of the Latin and the original pronunciation that the Grabar represented could be maintained. Ambrogio cannot know the chronology of this phonetic development and is, therefore, treating everything in the species of eternity or as the linguist would say synchronically.

Note that the use of the Septuagint's equivalent in the Armenian text of the Psalms argues that Ambrogio had an Armenian Psalter, which was not preserved among his Armenian Codices in Pavia; there are far too many quotations from the Psalms in the text of the '*Introductio...*' that cannot possibly come from the 'Breviary' MS 346. Moreover, this Psalter retains traces of the Septuagint text that have no trace in the received text of the Zohrabian or the Oskanean printed Bibles; this Psalter has all of the traits of a Chalcedonian Armenian liturgical work.

Verso 149:

As we now understand the principles behind Ambrogio's transliteration, I will only comment on his quotations and his anomalous spellings.

ԵնովՍ Enõs. ԵսրովՄ Esrõm. Եզեկիել Ezeciel. Եդոմ Edom. Եփրեմ Ephrem. ԵղիսաբէԹ Eglisabeth. These are largely from MS 178's list of Biblical names.

Luke 1, 57 (MS 347 Folio recto 65): Եւ ԵղիսաբէԹ լցան ժամանակք Ծնանելոյ եւ Ծնաւ որդի. 'eu Eglisabethi lztan zamanacch tznaneloi eu tznau ordi.' Only the transliteration of /zh/ is worthy of comment besides the lack of 'epenthesis' to the initial 'e' and 'o,' which are always pronounced 'ye' and 'vo' initially in the modern literary language, and it represents another load on the letter 'z.'

Psalm 131 (132 in the King James): ԱՀա լուաք զնՄանէ (զնաՄանէ) յեփրաԹա (յեփրաԹա). 'Aha luach znmane (znamanæ) i ephratha (yEphratha).' The text has a few minor deviations from the received text.

Once again the lack of any notation of the variant pronunciation of initial vowels 'e and o' allows speculation that Ambrogio had informants from dialects without this feature or that his transcription is generally unphonetic.

Recto 150:

2 Kings 5, 6 (2 Samuel 5, 6 in the King James Version; from MS 347, folio verso 121): Առ Եբուսացիսն (յեբուսացիՆ) բնակեալ յերկրիՆ 'Ar Ebusaztisn (Yebusac'in) bnaceal iercrin.' Note that the 'y-less' form of Jebusite is not the standard form in Armenian; the scribe must have assumed the 'y' to be the preposition 'i' and to have dropped it before the preposition 'arr.'

Luke 1, 67 (MS 347 Folio verso 66): Եւ զաքարիայ Հայր Նորա. eu Zachariai (Zacharia) hair nora.'

Mark 3, 17 (MS 347 Folio recto 90): և յակովբու զեբեդեա (Զեբեդեայ). eu iacoubu zebedea (Zebedeay).' Here the Latin spelling, which was contrasted above with one with 'th', is given in the Armenian and this last is the common spelling (Bedrossian).

Luke: 19, 5-6: զակքէ փուիա (փուիա) եշ (եչ այտի) զի այսօր յ (ի) տան քում պարտէ (արժան է) ինչ (ինձ) ագանել և փուիացեալ (փուիացաւ) եշ (եչ) և ընկալաւ զնա ուրախուիի (ուրախուիեամբ) ի տուն իւր. Zacchæ phutha ech (ædj ayti) zi aisôr i (i not y in the Armenian text) tan chum partæ (this word meaning from a cause or reason is replaced in the received text with the phrase, 'arzhan æ') ins (the text's 'inch' is a mistaken reading for indz) aganel, eu (there is no 'eu' but rather a :) phuthazteal ech eu iencalau zna vrahhuthani i tun iur (the last word of the received text is 'uraxutheamb'; the abbreviation of the 'thiwn' ending is regularly misunderstood by Ambrogio and the words 'i tun iur' are not in the received text; these words are not found either in the Vulgate and seem to be added to the text from an Armenian textual tradition). We note again the strange voiceless and supposedly aspirated stop form 'ech.'

The forms must have come from the errors found in MS 347, but the passage from Luke must be among the pages torn from the codex over the years after Ambrogio's death.   The misreading of 'indz' may be Ambrogio's or his typesetter's.

Verso 150-Recto 151:

Ambrogio begins to explore the meaning of 'z- and -n' in Armenian syntax.

John 8, 56 (From MS 347 missing folio between folio verso 75 and recto 76): Աբրահամ Հայր ձեր ցանկացաւ տեսանել զաւր իմ Abraham hair tser ztancazzau tesanel zaur im.' He notes that 'zaur' has two morphemes, z- and aur (day). The ' ts' marks as voiceless a normally voiced consonant (Eastern Dialect) although its position in sandhi may account for its being heard without voice. զԱբրահամ տեսեր zAbraham teser.'   He also notes in John 8, 58: զլինելն Աբրահամ (Աբրահամու) եմ ես zlineln

Abraham (Abrahamu) em es.'   This shows the postposed article and the preposed preposition/definite accusative marker. These passages are all taken from MS 347, but Ambrogio has miscopied the last quotation as the text clearly shows 'Abrahamu.'

Psalm 118 (although Ambrogio constantly refers to this psalm as 119, it is actually listed as 118 in Armenian Bible and the Vulgate and 119 in the King James Version): 163: ' զմեղս ապեցի և անարգեցի և զօրենս քո սիրեցի: zmegls atezti eu anargezti eu zôrens (zauræns) cho sirezti.' The use of long o suggests that this passage comes from MS 346 or from our lost Psalter, but not MS 347.

Verso 151:

Ambrogio continues to explore the semantics of z-. He also again notes the spelling 'au' against long o. He notes that the z- can command the noun or its preceeding adjective: զարժանին եպ˜ութէ˜. 'zarxanin episcoputhene.' Note the mistaken ending for -thean and the odd transliteration for voiced /zh/, which seems to imply voicelessness, which is rare in any Armenian dialect (Jahukyan; Greppin).

զնիկոլաոս ցուցեր զքո պաշտոնեայն 'zNicolaos ztuzzer zcho pastomeain' contrasts with զերանելին նիկոլաոս քահալ inverted Նապետն (քահանայապետն) քո 'zeranelin Nicolaos chahanaapetn cho. The double 'a' in the last word is anomalous. The 'z-' postposed adjective of the noun-phrase in the above two examples both come from non-Biblical sources and this is a charactristic of the Hellenizing School (Terian, 1980). It is important to remember that all of Ambrogio's manuscripts other than the two extensive 14th century translations of Latin liturgical handbooks, MS 346 and MS 347, were from the Hellenizing School: Porphyry, Aristotle and Philo. Thus, the syntactic and lexical peculiarities of these texts had an uncommon influence on him.   Texts, which would baffle the average Armenian were fairly clear to someone rooted in the scholastic traditions of Aristotelian interpretation.   The same is true of the Latinizers of the early Medieval period (13th century Krhnay) and of the 17th century (Galanus and Holov); one

finds them quoting extensively from Dionysios Thrax and other Hellenizing Grammarians and logicians.

Recto 152: See Ambrose insert:

Verso 152-Recto 154:

Ambrogio begins a discussion of the value of /æ/ and schwa. The discussion of schwa is the most fascinating as he correctly gives the phonetic environment of its initial use and, therefore has the clue to the pronunciation of z- before a consonant (before initial z, n, m, s, gl), yet he only gives this value recto 154.

Luke 24, 13 (MS 347 Missing folio 43): ԱՆունՆ Նորա Էմաւուս 'anun nora æmauus (Emmauus). The spelling with 'æ' is not common and is not suggested by the Latin, Emmaus.

He notes զքեզ 'zchez' and իզքեզ 'iezchez' saying that there is no change in the semantics.

He also gives examples of prepositions beginning with schwa:

Psalm 118 (Ambrogio identifies this as 119): 88: ըստ ողորմութեՆ~ քում կեցո զիս 'iest oglormuthene (-thean) chum cezto zis.'

Porphyry (MS 178): ըստ որում ասի. Նախ տեսաԼ inverted]ակ արժաՆի գոոոզութե~. 'iest orum asi nahh tesac arxani gorhozuthene (-thean).'

Psalm 146, 6: ըՆդունի զՀեզս տր~. 'ienduni zhezs tear (tær).'

Psalm 144 (145): եւ կաՆգՆե զաԼ inverted]~ գլորեայո. 'eu cangne (kangnæ) zamenezto (an inverted 'ayp' is the normal abreviation for 'zamenayn') gloieaio (this should be read 'gloreals' but the Armenian reading seems to be very corrupt and ends up as nonsense

with a schwa, for 'r,' written between 'o' and 'e' and the final 'l' set as a 'y.') Even if the page was damaged in the manuscript (almost all pasages from the psalms come from MS 346, which is much worn) this reading does not do Ambrogio any credit.

Psalm 135 (136), : ընդ մեջ (ի միջոյ) նորա. iend mesch nora.

Psalm 136 (135), 15: ընկղմեաց զփարաւն (զփարաւովն) և զզօրս իւր ի ծով կարմիր. iencglmeazt zpharauon eu zzors iur i tzou carmir.

Psalm 140 (141), 4: ընդ մարդս որ գործեն զանաւրենութաի. (զանօրէնութիւն) 'iend mards or gortzen zanaurenuthai (zanawrænuthiwn).'

The preposition is further explored as a verbal particle: ըմբոշխնել. iemboshhnel. which is a synonym for ընդունել կամ մաշել. iendunel cam mascel.

Psalm 118 (see above): ընբոն 'inbon (read 'iembon')' The word is not found in the psalm text of the Zohrabian Bible. Ambrogio thinks that this word is synonymous with նման. However, this word must be a misreading or a miscopied form.

Forms found in Porphyry's Commentary (MS 178) continue the investigation of the preposition with pronouns in the instrumental: ընդ սոաւ. iend soau. ընդ միմեամբք.ք. iend mimeambch. or ընդ ինքեամբեն. (ինքեամբ են) iend incheamben. The last case is clearly one of a fused verbal auxiliary.

John 1, 51 MS 347 Folio recto 9: Թէ ըսևս քան զայս տեսցես. 'thæ ieseus chan zais tesztes.' has many problems, not the least of which is 'ieseus;' this form is a miscopying by the scribe of MS 347 of Թէ տեսի ի ներքոյ Թզենւոյն՝ Հաւապան, մեծամեծ ևս քան զայս տեսցես:

ըզսապ 'iezsap' exists in no dictionary that I know as a word for 'heat.' I again suspect that the initial schwa is epenthetic.   ըղծիւ 'ieglxiu' is quite legitimate, but the following

ըզպանծալոյն. 'iezpanzzaloin' is an error for z- plus panzzaloyn. Note զըբարեկամս ziebarekams, where the pronunciation of 'z-' shows a non-initial schwa.

Porphyry: մերեալըն մարդ, մարդ ասել. 'merealien mard, mard asel.' illustrates the guide to pronunciation that schwa can give. In this case, Ambrogio shows complete understanding of the actual pronunciation of the postposed article.

Malachi 4: զեղիա թեզբացի 'zEglia thezbazzi.'

Verso 154:

John 10: 16: յայսմ գաւթէ. 'iaism gauthe (gauthæ); մի Հաւտ և մի Հովիւ. mi haut eu mi houiu. Ambrogio very mistakenly expatiates upon the puzzling nature of the changes in the spelling 'gauthe' to 'haut;' unhappily he is ignorant of the fact that these two represent quite different words: `sheepfold' and 'flock.'

Ambrogio has continued on to the letter 'Th.'

1 Timothy 6, 15: Թագաւորն Թագաւորաց և տեարն տերանց. Thagauorn (thagawor) thagauorazt eu tearn (tær) teranzt.

'Psalm 145:10 (146): Թագաւորեսցէ տր~ յտ~ն. 'Thagauoreszt (the transcription is missing the final 'e'; however, the received text is 'thagavoresc'æ') tear (Tær) iauitean.'

Թագաւորն խաղաղարար մեծագործեաց. 'Thagauorn hhaglaglarar mezzagorzzeazt.' This is possibly from the psalms, but the text is not identified; it certainly is a liturgical commonplace. Ambrogio has included it as a coda to the paragraph for more theological and hieratic than grammatical reasons.

We are now introduced to the letter ժ 'zh.'

Isaiah 9:2: ժողովուրդ որ շրջէր ի խաւարի եւես զլոյս մեծ. 'Zoglouurd or sarquer i hhauari etes zlois metz.' (the received text uses different words: zhoghovurd or gnayr ie(schwa)nd xawar etes loys mec; MS 347 does not have this text in its present much damaged state). Besides the variant reading of the text, the transcription of /dzh/ as 'qu' is very anomalous; furthermore, the transcription of the same word includes a helping vowel 'a' which is not written in the Armenian letters. A number of explanations been suggested to me concerning the odd transliteration 'sarquer'; one is that Ambrogius wrote 'scrgier' and that his handwriting was misread by his typesetter. This is not a very frequent occurrence in the book as a whole and therefore is doubtful. Since the Armenian would be a far more possible locus for mistakes and due to the odd reading of the text itself ('shrdzher' for 'gnayr') it is also possible that the text had originally 'sarkher' although the semantics are not particularly apt nor does this verb commonly appear in Grabar texts.[**]

Recto 155-Recto 156:

Psalm 110 (111):1-2: ուղղոց ի ժողովս. 'Vglglozt i goglous.' The received text is ուղղոց ի ժողովուրդս. 'ughghoc' i zhoghovurds.' The semantic distinction between 'zhoghov' and 'zhoghovurd' is quite small and the scribal shortening or legthening of the text is not unexpected.

Matthew 13:30: ժողովեցէք նախ զորոմն. 'Gogloueztech nahh zoromn.' The received text has been telescoped: `khaghec'ekh nax zoromnd ...ew zc'oreann zhoghovec'ekh ...' The two main verbs here again could be easily transposed by a scribe. By very consistently transcribing 'ou' as an Omega, even when before a vowel, Ambrogio has raised some question about his understanding of the sequence ouVowel (ovV) in contrast to ouConsonant (ôC).

Psalm 21:67(22): 'ժողովքդոց Zoglouchdozt' The Armenian is a misreading: 'kh' is read for an 'r': 'zhoghovrdoc'.' The pronunciation of /zh/ is quite stable in all dialects and the

---

[**] The first explanation is the kind suggestion of Prof. Alessandro Orengo of the University of Pisa and the second is an equally kind suggestion of Dr. Vazgen Hambardzoumian of the Armenian Academy of Sciences.

variations in transcription seen on these few pages illustrate the great difficulties that Ambrogio faced with this sound's transcription (so common in French and Slavic writing systems, but rare in Italian ones). If one looks at the transcription table of Bertoni's *Italia Dialettale*, Milan, 1916, it is very noticeable that 'z' appears in both the 'voiced' and 'voiceless' columns (as incidentally does 's'), and the seeming confusion within Ambrogio may be better located in the actual phonetic values 'z' has in Italian.

Matthew 26:18: վարդապետ ասէ, ժամանաք իմ մերձեալ է. 'Vardapet asæ, zamanach (zhamanak) im merssealæ (merjeal æ).' The voiced /dz/ is clearly transcribed voiceless, but the preceeding /r/ may account for that (a common sound change in Armenian dialects). On the other hand, Ambrogio may be unable to distinguish these sounds by voicing because of the limited number of available Latin letters and, not hearing the affricate nature of their articulation, he is keying in on the articulatory time of their production, their length (something an Italian ear could easily detect) and, therefore, using consistent digraphs for them.

Psalm 118 (see above): 164: ինանիր (ի նանիր), այլ (և) ի բանից կոց (քոց). 'inanir (a misreading for 'i nanir'), ail (ew) i baizt (should have read 'banizt') chozt ([khoc'] is a correction of the incorrect Armenian text 'cozt').' This first misreading leads Ambrogio into the fascinating trap of 'root etymology' and comparison of languages by sonic/semantic coincidence. The Latin 'inaniter' and the Hebrew 'hhinnam' seem similar to the Armenian while the Chaldaeic, Syriac and Arabic equivalents are quite other.

Ambrogio is interested in exploring the preposition 'i' which has so many different Latin reflexes. He discusses the 'i' in the instrumental '-iw' and in the genitive ' -i/-in' as if these were created by the insertion of an 'i' with its multitudinous prepositonal meanings; hence, he is trying to discover the quintessential meaning of the letter 'i.' He continues with the letter 'o' and its instrumental '-ov/-ovn' (again transcribed as Omega or 'ou' and taken from the instrumental of the word 'ordi.' Ambrogio cannot mistake the meaning of the text because it is the universally familiar Bible, but his speculations on the inner workings of Armenian

grammar and morphological etymology have little to stand upon except sound correspondences and tortured logic. Nonetheless, he describes the textual facts accurately.

John 1, 14: **Եւ բնակեցաւ (բնակեաց) ի մեզ.** 'eu bnaceztau (bnakeac') i mez.' Ambrogio's verb form is the classical middle-passive, while the received text has the active form). The middle-passive form becomes one of the standard conjugations, the '-im,' in Medieval and modern Armenian. It is interesting that in the modern Eastern literary language, this particular verb has a passive form, 'bnakvel, with an active-intransitive (middle) meaning, 'to reside or to dwell.'

Hebrews 1, 1: **խօսեցաւ ած՟ Հարցն (ընդ Հարցն մեր) մարգարէիւք (մարգարէիւք). ի վերջին աւուրս (ի վախչան աւուրցս) յայսոսիկ (այսոցիկ) խաւսեցաւ ընդ մեզ որդովն (որդւովն).** 'hhoseztau astuzt (The oblique stem is Ambrogio's general transcription for the Classical, 'Astuac') harztn (iend harsn mer) margareiuch (margaræiwkh), i verscin auurs (i vaxchan awurc's) iaisosic (aysoc'ik) hhauseztau iend mez ordoun (ordwovn).' Here, 'zt' isused for /ts/ rather than the more common /ts^h/. The form 'harztn' is the dative of 'hayr.' Ambrogio's 'i verscin auurs (dat,/loc. pl.)' is a synonymous rewording of the received text; the transcription of the normally voiced letter /dj/ is again possibly an effect of the preceeding 'r.' (Greppin, 1986) The preposition before the demonstrative creates confusion because the case of the demonstrative clearly coincides with the case of 'awurc's, not with Ambrogio's reading; thus, Ambrogio's text is corrupt. Finally, the case form of 'ordoun' is the Medieval/Modern, not the Classical.

Titus 3: **ոչ ի գործոց արդարութէ՟ զոր արարաք մեք.** 'os (och') i gordhozt (gorcoc') ardaruthene (ardaruthean) zor ararach mech.' The transcription 'dh' for 'c' is obviously a typographical error.

Psalm 109 (110): **քեզ տր՟ ի սիոնէ.** 'chez tear (Tær) i sione (Sionæ).'

Psalm 111 (112): ի Համբաւէ չարէ նա մի երկիցէ (երկիցէ). ' i hambauæ zaræ na mi ercizte (erkic'æ).'

Psalm 129 (130): ի խորոց կարդացի առ քեզ տեառ. 'i hhorozt cardazti arh chez tear (Tær).'; ի պահէ առաւաւտու. 'i pahæ arauautu.'

Verso 156:

Psalm 129: իԼէ~Լ ի տեառ: 'Israel (Israyæl) i tear (Tær).' The abbreviation for Israel takes a most peculiar form.

He notes that '-i' represents the oblique case and when added to the infinitive creates the gerundive.

Aristotle Periermenias: քանզի ոչ է. զոշն ամենայն մարդ ասելի. 'Chanzi oz æ, zosn amenain mard aseli.' As will be noted, the Aristotle from MS 178 (a far older manuscript) has far fewer abbreviated forms than does the Biblical material; unfortunately, Ambrogio rarely checked these discrepancies against one another, and if he had, he would have a far more consistent view of the Armenian declension system.

գնելի է: 'Ponendum vel constituendum est.' Although the form 'gnel' (to pay) is perfectly normal, Ambrogio's gloss makes it clear that he has mistaken an original 'dnel' (to put, to constitute). The two Armenian letters 'g' and 'd' are easily confused.

He is moving on to the letter Լ 'l.'

He lists the following declined forms for the word light: Լոյս lois, Լոյսն loisn, Լուսաւորէ lusauoræ, and Լուսոին lusoin.

Recto 157:

ԼԻՆԵԼ Linel and Լի li are to be found in John Chapter 1 and in Luke Chapter 12.

Psalm 21: ԼՍԵԼԻ ԼԻ3Ի Ի ԼՈՅՍ. 'Lseli lizzi i lois.' ԵՒ ԼԵԶՈՒ ԻՄ. 'eu lezu im'

2 Kings 1: ԼԵՐԻՆՔ ԳԵԼԲՈՎԱՅ. 'Lerinch gelb ai'

Mark 2: ԱՍԵԼ 'Asel'

Matth 5: ՈՉ ԵԿԻ ԼՈՒԾԱՆԵԼ ԱՅԼ ԼՆՈՒԼ. 'oz eci lutzanel ail lnul.'

Psalm 140: ՊԱՏԺԱՌԵԼ ԶՊԱՏԺԱՌՍ ՄԵՂԱ3. 'Patgarhel zpatgarhs meglazt.'

Mark 13: ԲԱՌՆԱԼ 'barhnal; ԱՌՆՈՒԼ 'arhnul.'

This is all couched within a discussion of the Armenian infinitive, its marking vowels and the development of a gerundive from the same form.

Verso 157:

We are moving on into the realm of the lettter Խ 'x' and Ambrogio's examples are becoming wilder. He lists a group of words having animal and zodiacal significance and others with onomatopoetic values.

ԽրիսոգոՆոս 'Hhrisogonos,' which he identifies with Latin Grisogonus. I cannot find this word in any dictionary. ԽՈՅ 'Hhoi,' ram; ԽԵ3ԳԵՏԻՆ 'Hheztgetin,' crab; ԽԱՅԹՈ3 'Hhaithozt,' spur, spike; ԽՈՆԱՐՀՍ 'Hhonarhs,' (in the acc. pl) humble; ԽԱՂԱՂՈՒԹԻ Hhaglagluthai,' peace.

Isaiah 55, 6: ԽՆԴՐԵ3ԵՔ ՏՐ՟ ՄԻՆՉ ԳՏԱՆԻԼ ԿԱՐԵ ԿՈՉԵ3ԵՔ ԶՆԱ ՄԻՆՉ ՄԵՐՁՆ Է. 'Hhendrezzech tear mins gtanil caræ coseztech zna mins merssan æ.' The Zohrabian reads: ԽՆԴՐԵ3ԵՔ ԶՏԵՐ Ւ [from apparatus: ՄԻՆՉԴԵՌ ԳՏԱՆԻ]

ուրժամ գտանիցէք զնա, կարդացէք   առ նա և [from apparatus: ցորչափի մերձ է] իրրև մերձեցոյ առ ձեզ: Note the use of the 'e' and the 'a' as schwas in 'hhendrezzech' and 'merssan' respectively.

Matthew 6, 33: Ընդրցէք նախ զարքախուխի այ˜ և զարդարուխին նորա. 'Hhendrezzæch nahh zarchaiuthai (զարքախուխիւն) astuztai (Աստուծոյ) eu zardaruthain (զարդարուխիւն) nora.' Obviously, the 'thiwn' declension has been mistreated by Ambrogio.

Recto 158:

Ambrogio quotes a number of words from Porphyry; most of them show extensive use of schwa in the spelling: Ըրխնջակաղն 'Hhiehhnscacann,' a horse's whinny; Ըրխրնջական ձի 'Hhiehhienscacan tsi.' (One could easily believe that these transliterations of Ambrogio's might have affected Swift in the writing of 'Guliver's Travels' if one could prove that he had access to the *Introductio*...); խամժակնուխի˜ 'Hhaxacnuthai,' which Ambrogio incorrectly glosses as 'having a curved nose' when it actually means 'having blue eyes.'

Any overall analysis of the various vowels used to represent 'schwa' on these pages alone (e, a, ie, and 0) would raise doubts about Ambrogio's understanding of the phonology: it is simply possible that he uses mid, low and front vowels because he cannot quite hear the Armenian sound and because the actual value is much mediated by the surrounding consonants ('a' with a nasal and 'e' or 'ie' with a palatal); however, 'ie' remains his usual reflex for a written schwa ը.

John 19, 15: և Հաղ զդա իխաչ. 'eu han zda i hhaz.'

The following are all extra-biblical, liturgical references to the 'cross.'

ի իխաչ Հաղիցեմ. 'I hhaz haniztem.'

Saint Andrew's supposed remark on seeing his instrument of martyrdom: ողջլեր իաչ պապուական. 'Oglzler hhaz patuacan.' (MS 346 123v)

կախեցաւ ի քեզ քս~ վարդապետն իմ. 'Cahheztau I chez christos vardapetn im.'

A devotional prayer concerning the cross: ով երանեալ իաչ իվադնչուց (ի վադնչուց) ցանկացեալ և այժմ տրփացելոյ Հոգոյն Նախապատրասեալ, ' erneal hhaz iuaglnzuzt ztancazteal eu aigm tarphazteloi hogoin nahhapatrasteal.' (MS 346 123v)

Verso 158:

Ambrogio makes an aside on the aspirated consonants ' Geth and Ohh' n Vandalic (Gothic?); the letters are vaguely similar to Gothic, but since they are written in by hand, there shape changes from example to example). He then proceeds to the letter ծ 'c.'

Matthew 27, 30: ծեծէին 'Tzetzaein.'

Luke 23, 49: ծանոթքն նորա. 'Tzan   thchn nora.'

John 19, 28: ասէ ծարաւիեմ (ծարաւի եմ). 'asae tzarauiem.'

Psalm 139 (140), 12: ծանեա (ծանեայ) ցի (զի) առնես տր` (Տէր). 'Tzanea zi (misspelled in Armenian) arhnes tear.'

Psalm 138 (139), 1: ծանեար 'Tzanear.'

I have found no source for this quotation: ծանեար/ծանեաւ ապա Հայր. 'Tzanear (emended to 'Tzaneau.') apa hayr.' Note that in the last three Ambrogio has collected the singular aorist conjugation of this verb.

John 4, 51: (from emendations) կենդանիէ (կենդանի է) 'Cendaniae.' (should be two words.)

Matthew 18, 32; Luke 19, 22: ծառա (ծառայ) չար (անՀաւատ The Luke passage has 'faithless' in the text, but 'evil' in the apparatus.) 'Tzarha zar.'

Matthew 18, 33: ողորմել ծառակցին (ծառայակցին) քում. 'Oglormel tzarhaczzin chum.' The form of the word 'fellow-servant' is not classical.

Recto 159:

From Porphyry: ծիծաղի, ծիծա(inverted)ղելովն, ծիծաղական Tzitzagli, Tzizaglel n (emended Tzitzaglel n), Tzitzaglacan.'

Apocalypse 7, 3 (Folio lost from MS 347): և ծովու և ոչ ծառոց. (մի՛ ծովու, մի՛ ծառոց) 'eu tz u eu oz tzarhozt.'; ծառայս (գծառայս) այ˜ (Աստուծոյ) Tzarhais astutzai.'

Psalm 21(22, 18): ծակեցին զձեռս իմ զոստ (զոտս). 'Tzacezzin ziserhs im eu zost (an error for 'zots')'

Psalm 111 (112, 4), : ծագեաց 'Tzageazt.'

Names from MS 178's list from Philo (Folio recto 8): կային, կայնան, կայիփա, կարմեղղոս, կարդես, կուրբան (կորբան). 'Caiin, Cainan, Caiiapha, Carmeglos, Cades, Curban (I clearly read 'corban).'

Matthew 27, 6 & 33 (MS 347 folio 4 recto): ի կուրբան (ի կորբանն). 'I curban.' (This phrase is glossed with the Latin 'in corbonam,' which itself is glossed in dictionaries as a

transliteration of a Hebrew phrase in Eccl. meaning 'treasure of the Temple': see 'Vocabolario della Lingua Latina,' 1966). **կառապիելոյ.** 'Carhapheloi,' (the place of the Skull)

John 1, 42: **Կե$աս.** 'Cephas,' (note that 'ph' has two values for Ambrogio) **դու (Դու) ես սիմոն (Սիմովն) որդի Յոնանու (Յովնանու) դու կոչեցիս կե$աս (Կեփաս) որ թագմանի** (emended **թարգմանի**) **Պետրոս.** 'Du (corrected in the transcription from 'g') es Simon ordi I nanu du cozesztis Cephas or thargmani (correct transcription of the emended Armenian) Petros.'

Paul I Corinthians 15, 5: **և թէ երևեցաւ կե$այի. (Կեփայի)** 'eu thae ereuezzau cephaii.'

Verso 159:

John 19, 15: **Թագաւոր բայցի (բաց) կայսերէ (ի Կայսերէ).** 'Thagauor baizti Caiserae.' This form, **բայցի,** is an older form of the commoner **բաց ի** (ironically, an English speaker, whose language uses 'but,' 'bayc','.both as a preposition meaning 'except' and as a conjunction, might feel the confusion natural and Acharyan suggests that there may be a common basis in Armenian for both forms; he sights the older form as found in Agathangelos).

Luke 2, 1: **յԱԼգուստոս կայսերէ.** 'I (preposed to noun in the Armenian) Augustos Caiserae.'

Ասորոց կիւրենեայ . 'Asorozt ciureneai.'

Matthew 22, 21; Mark 12, 17; Luke 20, 25: **տուք ապա զորս եՆՆ կայսերՆ կայսեր և զորս են այՆ(~) այ(~).** 'Tuch apa zors enn Caisern Caiser eu zors en astuztain astuztai.'

Porphyry: կալլիաս.'callias, կիկրոպեան.քն ի կիկրոպեա. Cicropeanchn I cicropea.' The Latin gloss 'Cecropidae a Cecrope' explains all: Cecrops was the first king of Attica and his dynasty was named after him; the phrase can be used to refer to any Athenian.

John 6, 17: ծովլուն ի կափառնաւում. 'Tz̄un I capharhnauum.'

Luke 7, 1: Եմուտ ի կափառնաում. 'Emut I Capharnaum.'

Luke 24, 18: կղ Եոպաս. 'Cgleopas.'

Recto 160:

Matthew 10, 4: սիմոն կանանացի. 'Simon cananazzi.'

Matthew 16, 13: ի կողմանս փիլիպպեա կեսարեայն. I coglmans Philippea Cesareain.'

կութին cuthin, Lac significat.

1 Peter 2, 2: կութինն փափագիցե.ք. cuthinn phaphagizzech. Ambrogio has made a singular error in mistaking the 'u' for a clearly written 'ayp'; the word for 'milk' is correctly written in the source for this passage MS 347 folio 153r.

1 Corinthians 11, 24; Matthew 26, 26: և կտրեց. eu catrezt, Առէ.ք կերէ.ք այսէ մարմին իմ. Ahræch ceræch aisæ marmin im.

From the prayers said on St Cecilia's Day: կիկիլիեա կուսին և վկային. Cicilea cusin eu vcain; իյերգելն նուագարանացն կիկիլիեա երգեր տո՞ն ասելով. եղիցի սիրտ իմ անբիծ զի մի յանօթեղեց.
iiergeln nuagaranaztn Cicilea erger tearn asel . eglizzi sirt im anbidh zi mi ian theglezt. Note that 'dh' is an uncommon transcription for /c/ (it is final). These must be from MS 346.

Verso 160:

Further references to the prayers of the feast day: կիկիլիա աղաֆին քո~տր որպ մեղուքեզ յանդիմանորէն ծառաեաց.
Cicilia aglahhin cho tear orpisi meglu chez iandiman   ren tzarhaeazt.

կլեմենդոս. Clemendos. A reference to St. Clement, a Pope.

St. Catherine: կատարինա կուսին և վկային. Catarina cusin eu vcain; կուսին պանծալոյ կատերինեա վկային սրբոյ. գտońս առի կատարել տուր մեզ արկայդ քս~. գթացեալ. Cusin pandhaloi Caterinea vchain surboi. Zt   ns arhi Catarel tur mez archaid Christos gthazteal. Note the internal transcription 'dh' and initial, 'tz.' Also note the variation in the spelling of Catherine, influenced no doubt by the Latin. (MS 346 184r/v)

Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 24, 17-18 Vulgate numbering from lost Folio of MS 347: զկիպրի. Zcipri; ի կադես. i cades.

John 21, 2: որ ի կանա գալիլեացոց. or i cana galileaztozt. MS 347 Folio 46r.

Recto 161:

The name կարողոս. Caroglos brings Ambrogio to thoughts about the Emperor Charles V and the wars with the Ottomans. It also brings him to make etymological speculations about the relation between that name of German origin, meaning basically 'slave, serf' and the Armenian word կարողուֆաի. Carogluthai 'capability, force, might.'

Paul: Ephesians 6, 11: և կարողուֆաի զաւրուֆենե նորա, եւ զգեցարուք զսպառազինուֆաի ~աի: զի կարող լինիջիք կալ ընդդեմ ֆնարից ռապանայի (սապանայի). eu Carogluthai zauruthene nora, eu zgeztaruch zsparhazinuthai astuztai: zi Charogl linizich cal iend demhnarizt satanaii. Satan is an emendation in the Armenian text and in the transcription, Ambrogio has incorrectly

divided the words of 'ienddem hnarizt.' This is another of the few examples of an incorrect division of words. Note that Ambrogio has transcribed 'k' with both 'c' and 'ch'; also note that the usually careful distinguishing of /c/ with the transcription 'tz' and /c^h/ with 'zt' starts to break down and we find the use of 'zt' for both of these forms.

Ambrogio enjoyed Macaronic punning, especially if he could turn the Biblical text into a modern and relevant admonition for the good of Christianity. Thus, the Pauline text can be modified to express the following Latin prayer for the Emperior Charles: Accipi at armatutam Dei, ut potens sit: Առեսցէ զսպառալինութաին (զսպառագինութաին) ասպուծայ զի կարոլ լինիցի. Arhæsztæ zsparhalinuthain astuztai. Zi Carol linizti. And the Emperor's victory will bring the following Divine restitution: Indutus loricam iustitiae, & calciatus pedes in praeparatione Euangelii pacis: զկեցեալ (զզեցեալ) զրահն (զրահն) արդարութենէ, և Հագուցեալ զուտս պատրաստութաբ աւետարանին խաղաղութենէ. Zcezteal zrhahn ardaruthene, eu haguzteal zots parastuthab (corrected in emendations to 'patrastuthab') auetaranin hhaglagluthene. Note the lack of the 'nasal' in the intrumental form '-thamb.'

The cases are clearly given very abnormal forms in this passage.

Verso 161:

This page conains a list of Biblical and Classical Greek names with their etymologies taken from MS 178 from Philo and Porphyry. He is beginning to explore the letter 'h.'

Ճեղի. Ճուբէլ. որ Թարգմանի մեծ ասպուծ, Hegli. Hubel, or thargmani metz astutz, Ճոմերոս.ճերակլեանք. ի ճերակլեա. Ճոմասեռ. Homeros, Heracleanch, I Heraclea. Homaserh. ճիլոն. ճետևակն. ճետևակէ մարդ. ճետևակին Hilon. Heteuacn. Heteuacæ (the copula is not separated) mard. Heteuacin. զբան է Zban æ.

He notes the 'i' of the genitive comes between the '-c- and the -n' and that the nominative case is without the intrusive vowel. He continues to explore cases on the following pages.

Recto 162:

Acts 12, 1: ՃԵՐՈՎԼԴԵՍ. Her des; ՃԵՐՈՎԼԴԵԻ. Her dæi.   Here we have declension members.

Matthew 2, 1: ՅԱՒՈՒՐՍ ՃԵՐՈՎԼԴԵԻ ԱՐՔԱՅԻ. iauurs Her dæi archaii.

Mark 6, 16: ՎԱՍՆ Զ ՃԵՐՈԴԻԱ. Vasn z Herodia.

This leads on to further explorations of proper nouns found within his texts, especially MS 346, which is a calendar of the Saints: ՃԵԼԵՆԱ ՄԱՅՐՆ ԿՈՍՏԱՆԴԻՆՈՍԻ. Helena mairn Constandinosi.

He also notes the placement of an 'h' before Greek names with initial 'r', which seems motivated by the 'hard breathing mark' usually placed over initial Greek Rho;interestingly enough, he ignores this 'H' in his transcriptions of the words with it: ՃՌԱՓԽԱԵԼ. ՃՌԱԳՈՒԵԼ. ՃՌՈՒԹ. ՃՌԵԲԵԿԱ. Raphael. Raguel. Ruth. Rebeca.

Matthew 2, 17-18 (from Jeremiah 31, 15): ՃՌԱՄԱ. Rama.ՃՌԱՔԵԼ. Rachel.

Verso 162:

Thus, the Greek for 'rose' would appear as ՃՌՈԴՈՆ. Rhodon although the actual word in Armenian is ՎԱՐԴ. Vard.

As found in Sirach or Ecclesiasticus 24: ԶՏՈՒԿՆ ՎԱՐԴԵՆՈՅ Ի ԵՐԻՔՈՎ. ztucn vardenoi i erich .

Isaiah 62, 2: ՀԵԹանոսՔ. Hethanosch.(The new translation into Armenian uses 'azger')

We now move on to the pronunciation of 'j':

Ծայն. Xain, Vox

Psalm 28 (29), 3: Ծայն տեարն. Xain tearn. Note that Ambrogio's rendering of the letter suggests that he heard no voicing.

Isaiah 66, 6: Ծափն բարբառոյ ի քաղաքէ. Ծայն ի տաճարէ. Ծայն տեարն Հատուցտանէ զՀատուցումն Հակառակորդաց.
Xain barhbarhoi i chaglachæ. Xain i tagaræ. Xain tearn hatuztanæ zhatuztumn hacarhcordazt.

Isaiah 40, 3: Ծայն բարբարոյ յանապատի. Xain barhbarhoi ianaparti.

Psalm 119 verses 48, 73, 109, and 173: Ծեռն. Xern, Manus.

Ezekiel 47, 10: Ծուկն. Xucn; տԾուկն բազում յոյժ. Txucn bazum ioiz. The text in MS 347 verso 133 agrees with the Zohrabian: բազմութ˜բ բազում յոյժ. The form տԾուկն comes from none of Ambrogio's manuscripts and makes no paticular sense, especially as the strange տ‑ is not commented upon.

John 21, 3: երթամ Ծուկնորսալ. Ertham Xucnorsal.

Recto 163:

Luke 5, 2: MS 347 Folio missing: ԾկՆորսՔն. Xacnorschn. Note the use of 'a' to represent a schwa.

Ambrogio now mentions a series of rare verbs that are synonyms of more common verbs: Ծանձել. Tsanxel. means the same as առնսւլ [sic] (առնուլ). arhnul. which is

similar to Լամբել. Lambel. which in turn has a similar meaning to ձախի. Tsaxi. which means առնու. arhnu. Note that the initial sound can be transcribed with a 'Ts,' and that this again marks a 'voiced' sound as voiceless for Ambrogio. He also mentions ձիր. Tsir. which has a similar meaning to պարգև կամ շնորհ. pargeu cam scnorh. It is usually rare for him to use 'sc' as the transcription for /sh/.

Note that the listing of these synonyms is evidence that Ambrogio had been keeping some sort of glossary as he worked through the Armenian materials in his manuscripts. The existence of some leaves of a Hebrew glossary in his hand suggests that this could have been his practice in all of his Oriental languages.

He mentions the similarity of the Armenian letter to the fourth Vandalic letter 'Tzeds,' but no one quite knows what this alphabet is. He mentions other letters of this alphabet as well (see listing of pages found in his table of contents).

He continues on to 'gl' and these names are from the Philonic list found in MS 178 as well as common names from MS 347:

Ղամէք. Ղովտ. Ղաբան. Ղեւի. Ղոբենա. Glamech, Gl t, Glaban, Gleui, Globena.

Ղոբնի. Ղաքիս. Ղորէոս. Ղուկաս. Ղազարոս. Globni, Glachis, Gloræos, Glucas, Glazaros.

John 11, 1: Լազարոս հիվանդէր. Glazaros hiuandær, Pavia MS 347 folio 38.

Matthew 10, 3: Ղեբէոս. Glebæos, Pavia MS 347 folio 67.

Verso 163:

It is interesting that Ambrogio transcribes his Greek references on this page in a way quite close to that of the Armenian. His transcription of Lambda is 'gl' as that also transcribes Ղ. See his transcription of κατάηξιϲ cataglicsis and άνάλυσιϲ anaglysis. This raises the question of just what sound Ambrogio heard represented by this transcription. I have already suggested that it is a velar (the 'g') lateral (the 'l').

Ambrogio now makes extended reference to his list of Armenian-Greek pharmalogical plants and herbs found in Pavia MS 178.

Ղաթպաթոն. glathpathon, pro lapatio herba. which is աւելուկ. aueluc, a frequently eaten herb.

Ղիբանոտիս. glibanotis, quæ a nostris libanotis, and is կնդրուկ. candruc in Armenian (frankincense). Note the use of 'a' for schwa again.

Ղոտոս. glotos, our lotus from Greek, while the Armenian is ներգիւն. nergiyn. This last uses 'y' upsilon or 'y' Grec to represent the letter usually transcribed 'u,' but this possibility is already listed in the alphabet table and is recognized as the etymological origin of the Armenian letter.

Recto 164:

Matthew 6, 22 MS 347 Folio verso 27; verso 90: ճրագ մարմնոյ ակն է. Irag marmnoi acnae.

Psalm 131(132), 17: զճրագ oծելոյ իմ. zirag tzeloi imo.

ճերվազիոս. Geruazios. ճերմանոս. Germanos. ճերոնիմոս. Hieronimos.

մամբրէ. Mambre. մեմփիս. Memphis. միքաիէլ. Michaiel. մովսէս. M ses. մովաբ. M ab. մագովգ. Mag g. մալաքիա. Malachia. մանասէ. Manasae.

Մարիամ. Mariam. Մարթա. Martha. Մակդաղինէ. Macdaglinae. Մաթեոս. Matheos. Մարկոս. Marcos. Մելքիսեդեկ. Melchisedec.

Hebrews 7, 1 & 2: MS 347 Folio missing: Թագաւուր (Թագաւոր) արդարութենէ (արդարութեան) կամ խաղաղութաի (խաղաղութիւն). Thagauur (Thagawor) ardaruthene (ardaruthean) cam hhaglagluthai (xaghaghuthean). Ambrogio has added the 'kam' in summarizing Paul's commentary on the priesthood of Melchizedek.

Psalm 109 (110), 4: ըստ կարգին Մելքիսեդեկի. Iest cargin melchisedeci.

Matthew 6, 24: MS 347 Folio verso 90 (och kare'k' a~y car'ayel ew Mamonai): Մամոն. Mamon; ոչ կարէքասստուծայ ծառայել և Մամոնի (Մամոնայի). Oz carech astutzai tzarhaiel eu mamoni (Mamonayi).

Verso 164:

The letter 'I' has two forms a majuscule and a minuscule in this case (one of the three Armenian letters in his font with these forms).

Յարեղ. Iard. Յափեթ. Iapheth. Յեքտան. Iechtan. Յուղայ. Iudai. Յովսեփի. I seph. յակովբոս. Iac bos. յետտամ. Iettam. յեզրայել. Iezrael. յւվսափատ. Iosaphat.

Յաւիտենական. Iauitenacan. յաւիտենական. Iauitenacan.

Hosea 11, 1: MS 347 Folio missing: Յեգիպտոսէ կոչեցից զորդի իմ. Iegiptosae cozeztizt zordi im.

Luke 15, 14: MS 347 Folio verso 107 (յաշխարհին յանմիկ.yashxarhin yanmik): յաշխարկին յամմիկ. I aschharcin iammic. (Zohrabian: յաշխարհին

յայնմիկ.yashxarhin yaynmik). There is a great deal of misunderstanding in Ambrogio's reading of the text. Note the possible assimilation of nasals here; it seems to happen frequently and could be an influence of Ambrogio's native phonology (Ramat).

Նաքովր. Nach r. Նեփթալիմ. Nephthalim. Նեբրովթ. Nebr th. Ննուէ. Nnuae, Նաթանաէլ. Nathanael

John 1, 45 & 46: MS 347 Folio recto 9; verso 51 (zordi yo'sephay I nazarethe' ase'/asac' c'na..) զՆաթանայէլ. Znathanaiel...զորդի յովսեփայ ի Նազարէթէ, ասէ (ասաց) զնա (զնա) Նաթանայէլ, իսկ ի Նազարէթէ. Zordi I sephai I nazarethae, asae zna (c'na) nathanaiel, isc I nazarethae.

Recto 165:

Matthew 21, 10 & 11 MS 347 Folio verso 59 (nazarethe'):ուլ իզ է սա.   iztae sa. որ ի Նազարէթէ (Նազարէթէ) գալիլացիոց. or I nazaraethae (nazarethe') galilaztiozt. It is noteworthy that all of the attestations preserve an 'l' in Galillee rather than 'gh.'

Luke 7, 11: MS 347 Folio verso 20 (Nayin): Նային. Naiin. որում անուն էր Նային. orum anun aer naiin (Nayin).

John 10, 22: MS 347 Folio 120 (Eghen yaynzham no'akatik'n): եղեն յայնժամ Նoակատիքն (Նաւակատիքն). Eglen iainzam n   acatichn (Nawakatik'n).

Verso 165:

Here Ambrogio interprets the '-n' affix as if a declensional ending although he identifies it as a 'affixum pronomen.' It should be noted that this affix does and did then have some aspects of a nominal inflection in the colloquial langauage of the Eastern dialects (it distinguishes the accusative from the dative form, which are both descended from the Classical dative).

աշակերտ.ք. asacertch.

Matthew 5, 1: MS 347 Folio 32: աշակերտ.քն նորա. asacertchn nora.

Mark 13, 8 & 12: MS 347 Folio recto 144: զի յարիցէ ազգ. Zi iariztae azg...զի յարիցեն. zi iarizten.

Second Periermenias (Aristotle's On Interpretation): MS 179 Folio verso 128: անուն. Anun. բայց անաւնն (անուննն). Baizt anunn. իսկ որ ոչ կար, ոչ եղանել. անկար, ոչ եղանել, իսկ որ անկարն, ոչ եղանել, ճարկաւոր եղանել. Isc or oz car, oz eglanel, anear oz eglanel. Isc or ancarn, oz eglanel, harcauor eglanel.

Recto 166:

Second Periermenias (Aristotle's On Interpretation): MS 179 Folio verso 151 (the text is a conflation of a number of set phrases): և գոլն, և ոչն գոլ, իսկապա և եղանիլն, և ոչն եղանիլ (եղանել). eu goln, eu ozn gol, iscapa eu eglaniln, eu ozn eglanil vel eglanel.

շինէ զեմ~ որ~.

շուշանա. Susana. շարական. Saracan.

John 20, 19. MS 347 Folio 50; verso 83: շաբաթուն. (ի միաշաբաթւոջ.) Sabathun. MS 347 has the same phrase as the Zohrabian.

Psalm 118, 13: շրթամբ.ք իմով.ք. Sarthambch im ch. This is correct, but Ambrogio takes the oblique form into the nominative.

Malachia 2, 7 MS 347 Folio verso 131: շրթանք (շրթունք) քահանային զգուշասցին գիտութենե (գիտութեան). Sarthanch chahanaiin zgusasztin

gituthene. The first word not only has an intrusive vowel in the first syllable, it has also been misread. MS 347 agrees with the Zohrabian.

Psalm 143, 13: ՉտեմարանՔ Նոցա լի են. Stemaranch nozza li en.

Psalm 146, 2: Շինէ զեմ՞ սր՞. Sinae Zieruslem tear.

John 1, 14 MS 347 Folio 54: Լի շնորՀօր և Ցշմարտութենէ (Լի շնորՀոՔ և ՑշմարտութեամՔ). Li snorh r eu ismartuthene. The first form is clearly a misreading: the MS has Լի շնորՀաւՔ և Ցշմարտութ՞Ք.

Verso 166:

Athanasius' Symbols (perhaps part of 178): և օչ շփոթելով զանծինան. eu oz sphothel   zanssinsn.

ոլիբամա. Odlibama. ոոլիբա. Oogliba. ոզիէլ. Oziel. ոզա. Oza. ոՔոլիա. Ochozia. ուրիա. Vria. ովբթ.   beth.ովսէէ.   saeae. ուրիէլ. Vriel. ոզիա. Ozia.

Isaiah 6, 1 MS 347 Folio verso 124: և եղև յամին յորում մեռաւ ոզիայ (ոզիա) արՔայ. eu egleu iamin iorum merhau oziai (ozia) archai.

Porphyry: ովրեստես ի տանտալեա.   restes i tantalea.

Matthew 21, 9 & 15 MS 347 Folio verso 48: ովսաննայ   sannai. ովսաննայ օրՀնութայ (օրՀնութիւն) որդոյ դաւթի   sannai orhnuthai (orhnuthiwn) ordoi Dauthi. The text is from MS 347, and the Zohrabian text lacks the 'Hosanna.'

Recto 167:

Matthew 6, 34 MS 347 Folio verso 90: չար. Zar.

Luke 6, 43 & 45 MS 347 Folio verso 106: պտուղ չար. Ptugl zar. ծառ չար. Tzarh zar. և մարդ չար ի չարէն թէէ (թղթէ) գչարն. eu mard zar i zaraen bhhae zzarn. All of the faults of the text are found in MS 347.

Luke 16, 25 MS 347 Folio verso 113: և ղազարոս նոյնպէս (նոյնպէս) գչարչարանան (գչարչարանս). eu glazaros noimpaes zzarzaransn. Note that Ambrogio has progressive assimilation shown in the transliteration '-mp-'.
չարահաւ. Zarahau is the same as չարագործ. Zagortz. (this is a typographical error).

Luke 23, 32 & 33 MS 347 Folio verso 5: ածին և այլ երկուս չարագործս սպանանել ընդ նմա. Atzin eu ail ercus zaragortzs spananel iend niema. ի խաչ և գչարագործն. I hhaz eu zzaragortzsn.

Verso 167:

Պետրոս. Petros. վեմ. Vem. Պաւղոս կամ պօղոս. Pauglos kam poglos. Պասեք կամ փերկութաի. Pasech kam phercuthai (phrkuthiwn). Պեատրիս. Peatris. (Italian Beatrice, in a late Middle Armenian transcription). Պռնարտոս. Prhnartos. (Bernardus). Պիղատոս. Piglatos. Պորփիրիոս.
Porphirios.

Porphyry: (MS 178): Պլատոն աթենացի. Platon athenazti. առ պելլեպոնեսականն. arh pellaeponesacann.

Զեփերիանոս. Zaephaerianos. Զասինքթոս. Zasinchthos. Զուրհոյս. zurhois. (the Zodiacal sign Aquarius).

Recto 168:

Ecclesiastical hymn (MS 346): ՟որՆ (՟ուրՆ) յուրդաՆաՆու վարՀուրեզաւ. zurn iordananu zarhureztau.

Psalms 135 (136) 5 & 147 (148), 4: ՟ու.ք. (corrected ՟ուր.ք.) zurch.

Porphyry: ՟երուցաՆեԼ. zeruztanel. ՟երուցաՆե. zerhuztanae. ՟երՄայիՆ. zermaiin. ՟երՄ. zerm. ՟երՄե. (՟երՄ ե) zerme. ('j'erm ae': see note in Conybeare concerning tendencies of early orthography to avoid 'long e' and to combine noun and auxiliary). ի ՟երՄաՆոյ. I zermanoi. Ambrogio has given the lexical derivations of the root 'warm.'

ՌուփոՍ. Rhuphos. ՌեՄիՃիաՆոՍ. Rhemigios. ՌեբեԿԿա. Rhebecca. ՌագաԼ. Rhagau. ՌեԿաբ. Rhechab. ՌաԼՄաՆոՍ. Rhaumanos. ՌոՄաՆոՍ. Rh manos. ՌաՄովԹ. Rham th. Ռաբբի. Rabbi. which is վադապետ (վարդապետ) Vardapet.

John I, 38 MS 347 Folio recto 10: ասեՆ ցՆա, Ռաբբի որ ԹարգՄաՆեաԼ կոշի վարդապետ ուր եՆ օԹևաՆ.ք .քո. Asaen ztna rabbi or thargmaneal cozi vardapet, vr en   theuanch (thevank') cho.

Verso 168

Ambrogio ever in the mode of eternity uses as examples three different spellings of the Greek title of Aristotle's *On Interpretation* : բեՌարՄեՆիաՍ. Berharmenias, ՊերիարՄեՆիաս Periarmenias, ՊերԼարՄեՆիաս, Peryarmenias. He opines the identity of 'b' and 'p' and of 'rh', 'ri', and 'ry.' This last assumes that 'hiwn' is directly derived from 'upsilon.' As Conybeare points out, the notes and text are intermixed in the MS and Middle Armenian and Classic forms can be found throughout the work.

սէթ, Seth. սեմ, Sem. սէիր, Seir. սաղեմ, Saglem. սաբեդոն, Sabedon. սեփփորա, Sephphora. ստեփանոս, Stephanos. And this name takes us to Stephan's last great summary of Biblical lore prior to his martyrdom:

Acts 7, 55 MS 347 Folio missing: իբրև (և նա) եր լի Հոգովն (Հոգւով) սրբով, Ibreu (ew na) er li hog n (hogwov) surb . Note that the transliteration of 'srbov' does not delete the root vowel.

Matthew 22, MS 347 Folio recto 53: սադուկեցիք, Saduceztich. զսադուկեցիսն zsaduceztisn. Ambrogio comments on this alteration of 's' and 'k"; then he sets out the consonantal alterations ց, լ, ր, in the deictic pronouns: (all taken from Porphyry) այսոսիկ, aisosic. այսոցիկ, aisozzic. այդքիկ, aisochic. այսուիկ, aisuic. այսորիկ. aisoric.

Recto 169:

John 10 & Matthew 5 are given as two of many scriptural locations where the various forms of նոսա,նոցա, նոքա. nosa, nozta, nocha are found.

Porphyry: plurality and inflection are shown to be properly synthetic: ասութիւն. asuthiun. 'saying' ասութիւնս. asuthiuns. 'sayings' (but accusative case as well). Հակասութիւնն. Hacasuthiunn. 'Contradiction' Հակասութիւնսն. Hacasuthiunsn. 'Contradictions' բացասութիւնն Baztasuthiunn. 'Negation' բացասութիւնսն. Baztasuthiunsn. 'Negations' Nominative: սոկրատես և պղատոն. Socrates eu Pglaton; Genetive: սոկրատոյր և պղատոնոյր. Socratoir eu Platonoir. սոփրոնիսկոս,
Sophroniscos.

Verso 169:

Names from MS 178 and scriptural and liturgical sources: վալենդ. Valend. վետաստոս. Vetastos. վերզելայ. Verhzelai. վիցենցիոս. Viztenztios. վիտալիս. Vitalis. վլասայ. Vlazai. վիպիանեա. Vipianaea. վերադիտող.

Veraditogl. (Bishop: Overseer) վարդապետ, Vardapet. Note that a late Latin name such as Vincent was pronounced with strong palatalization in the 14th century as these names come from MS 346.

2 Timothy 4, MS 347 Folio missing: կուտեսցեն իւրեանց վարդապետս. Cuteszten iureanzt vardapets.

և վարդապետութենե. eu Vardapetuthene. He collects more lexical derivatives.

Luke 16 MS 347 Folio verso 111: վաղվաղակի. Vaglvaglaci.

տուբիա. Tubia. տաբիթա. Tabitha. տուբերտիոս. Tubertios. տոմինիկոս. Tominicos.

Psalm 145 (146), 7: տա (տայ) Հաց քաղցելոս (քաղցելոց) և արձակէ (արձակէ) զկապեալս տեար (Տէր). Ta hazt caglztelos eu arxace zcapeals tear.

Porphyry: տանտալիդես. Tantalides.

Aristotle: տեսակ. Tesac equals սբեցիես. Spezties (actually spelled with a 'sb-'); տարբերութայ. Tarberuthai equals տիփերենցիա. Tipherenzzia. These Armenian Latinisms were writtten on the last page of the text of MS 178. Folio 101 of MS 179 has the Greek-Armenian philosophical vocabulary in Armenian letters.

Recto 170:

Psalm 119 (118), 141: տանուկ (Մանուկ) եմ ես. Tanuc em es. (he has misread the word for 'child/small')

րաՀեսլ. Rahesy. րոդոն կամ ռոդոն, Rodon kam rhodon. վարդ. Vard. րոպէ. Rope (ropae) is synonymous with աշխարհ. Ashharh

John 20, 16 MS 347 Folio lost: ռաբունի. Rabuni. եբրայեցտարէն ռաբունի որ թարգմանի վարդապետ. Ebraieztaraen rabuni (Rabbuni) or thargmani vardapet.

Verso 170:

ցուլ. Zzul. (Taurus) ցուտ. Zzut. ցող. Zz gl. ցեց. Zzezt.

Matthew 6, 20 MS 347 Folio recto 97: գանձեցեք ձեզ գանձս յերկինս ուր և (0) ոչ ցեց և ոչ ուտի ջապականէ (ուտիչ ապականէն). Ganxeztech xez ganxs iercins vr euoz (och') zzezt euoz (ew och') vti gapacane (utich apakanen). Again, Ambrogio has misdivided a word and created a nonce form, while missing the Armenian for 'worm.' Interestingly, the MS 347 copyist was equally uncertain here as he had (ուտէ ջապականէն/ուտէչ ապականէն) 'outae chapakanen' or 'outaech apakanen.' Ambrogio seems to have misscopied this passage as he misses the proper plural form of the verb and the first instance of 'euoz' is not in the text.

John 2, 18 MS 347 Folio verso 47-48: զուցանէս, Zuzzanes. This form is nonexistent. զինչ նշան ցուցանես դու մեզ զի զայդ առնես. Zins nsan zzuzzanes du mez zi zaid arhnes. Ambrogio mistakes the synonymy of 'z' and 'c'' in this passage due to the difficulty of reading his MS's hand.

John 1, MS 347 Folio: ցնա, zna. This form's transliterated 'z' actually represents 'c''.

Ambrogio speculates that this situation is similar to the pronunciation of 'ci' and 'ti' in Latin.

Recto 171:

Plants MS 178 Folio recto 4: Լիւդոս պեպեր: Yiudos peper (from the Greek) is equivalent to Armenian պղպղակ: Pegleglac. Լիպերիկոն. Yipericon. գոջամաւրու. Gohamauru. Լսիպոն. Ysipon. մարզանգաւշ. Marzangaus.

իւսողոս անուն է մարդոյ. Yiusochos, anun ae mardoi.

փիսովն. Phis n. փաղեկ. Phaglec. փարես. Phares. փարփար. Pharphar. փեգովր. Pheg r. More names from Philo's list in MS 178. բեեղ բեգովր. Beeglbeg r. With this name, he explores the loss of intervocalic aspiration in the transliteration of Semitic names into Greek and occasionally into Armenian, from Greek.

Psalm 105 (106), 30: փենեհեզ. Phenehez. This form is from Philo; Ambrogio notes that the Psalms have Փենեես (Փենեէս) Phinees.This opens up into a comparative analysis of this name in Greek (Phinees; the same as canonical Armenian above), Hebrew (Pinchas), and Syriac (Phinhhes). It is interesting that this form of the name is closer to the Semitic original natural for Philo's list rather than to the Greek, which is to be expected in an Chalcedonian Psalter. Here are the transliterations of the various forms of this name: Greek: Phinees, Hebrew: Pinchas, Targum (from Nebbio's Psalter): Phinehhas, Syriac: Phinhhes, and Arabic (from Nebbio's Psalter): Phinhhas.

Verso 171:

This leads into an extended discussion of the aspirated or unaspirated nature of the voiceless labial stop in Syriac, Chaldaic, Arabic, Punic, Persian, and Tatar. He also mentions the Armenian simplification of ps>p in most common Greek borrowings.

Recto 172:

քամ. Cham. քրիստոփորոս. Christophoros. քրիստինեա. Christinea. քորեբ. Choreb. քալիքսթոս. Chalichsthos.

Psalm 111 (112), 5: քաղց (Corrected քաղցր) այր ողորմի. Chaglzzr air oglormi.

Porphyry: քարական ի քարականութենե. Characan i characanuthene.

Matthew 27, 28 MS 347 Folio verso 3: քղամիթր կարմի. (քղամիդ կարմիր.) Chglamithr carmi (k'ghamid karmir). This incorrect form is correctly copied

from the manuscript. The word 'k'ghamithr' appears again in the passage. Evidently, the copyist did not understand this Greek word for a cloak, yet misspelling 'karmir' is very unexpected.

John 2, 19 & 20 MS 347 Folio 48: ** քակեցէ՛ք զտաճարդ զայդ.** Chacezzech zthagard zait. **զ.քառասուն և զվեց ամ՛շ ինեցաւ (ամ շինեցաւ) տաճարս այս.** Zcharhasun eu zuezt ams ineztau (am shinec'aw) tagars ais. Note that Ambrogio is careless in transcribing Armenian 't.' The text in the manuscript is correctly divided and there is no reason for the misdivision of the simple words found here.

2 Kings 5, 1 MS 347 Folio 121: **ի .քեբրո՛ն.** I chebron.

Verso 172:

Luke 15, 7 MS 347 Folio 30: **քամ. (.քա՛ն.)** cham. **քամ (.քա՛ն) վն՞ ի՛ն՛սուն և ի՛ն՛ս (ի՛ն՛) արդ.դոյ** (corrected **արդ.ոյ) (արդ.արոյ).** cham van innsun eu inns ardoi (corrected from the emendations). This incorrect form of 'k'an' is surprising as is the mistaken form of 'ardaroy.' MS 347's version of the text is the same as the Zohrabian's.

Եսեբիոս. Eusebios.

Matthew 2, 1 & 2 MS 347 Folio 23-25: **յարևելից.** Iareuelizt. **յարևելս.** Iareuels. Here we have the different cases used with the preposition.

Psalms 134 (135), 9 & 135 (136), 15: **Փարաւովն. (Փարաւոն.)** Pharau n. **Փարաւովն. (Փարաւոն.)** Pharaon. **զՓարաոն (զՓարաւոն) և զօրսիւր (զզօրս իւր) ի ծով կարմիր.** Zpharaon eu zorsiur i tzou carmir.

John 1, 44 MS 347 Folio 9: **Փիլիպպոս ի բեդսայիդա (բեթսայիդայ).** Philippos i bedsaida. Ambrogio's text is taken from MS 347.

Matthew 5, 19 MS 347 Folio recto 11: ֆուքր (փուքր) կոշեոցի (Corrected կոշեցցի) յ արքայութենէ (յարքայութեան) երկնի (երկնից). Phochr cozeszti i archaiuthene ercni. Here 'ph' and 'f' are clearly misapplied. The manuscript agrees with Zohrabian.

Recto 173:

Luke 2, 1 MS 347 Folio verso 21: Օգուստոս և Աւգուստոս. Ogustos eu Augustos. The manuscript and Zohrabian have 'aw.'

Mark 16, 6 MS 347 Folio missing: զ˜յս իՆդրէք զՆազօրացի զիսաշելեալՆ. ZIesus hhendraech zNaz razti (Nazovrac'i) zhhazelealn. He points out that both Օ. 'o' and ոԼ. 'ov' can represent Greek 'omega.'

Luke 24, 19 MS 347 Folio verso 43 torn from book: Նազովրացոյ. Naz razzoi (Nazovrac'woy).

Verso 173:

Matthew 2, 23 MS 347 Folio 25: Նազարէթ զի լցցի բաՆ մարգարէիցՆ (մարգարէիՆ) թէ Նազովրեցի կոշեցի (կոշեցցի). Nazareth zi lizzzti ban margaraeiztn (margaraein) thae Naz rezzi cozezti (koch'esc'i). Ambrogio's text follows the manuscript.

աԼ. ոԼ. can be used to spell the same word.

Mark 16, 2 MS 347 Folio missing: օծցեմ. oxzzem. օծցեՆ զՆա. oxzzen zna.

Psalm 131 (132), 11 & 18: օծել. oxel, յաւծելո (յoծելny) քումմէ. Iauxelo chummae. oծելո իմո (oծելny իմny). oxelo imo.

John 1, 39 MS 347 Folio 10: օթևան. otheuan. աւթևանք (օթևանք). autheuanch. (thevank') Oddly enough, MS 347 uses the 'long o' form of the word in its text.

Recto 174:

Psalm 146 (147), 2 & 8: աւրՀնեցէք. aurhneztech.   օրքնութաի. (օրՀնութիւն.)   rchnuthai. օրքնութը, (օրՀնութեամբ.)   rchnutaib. The strange forms with 'k" for 'h' cannot be explained: Acharrean in his Root Dictionary does not list any dialect form that has 'k" for 'h'; however, 'th' is found and forms without 'r' show the development of 'rh' to 'sh' and 'x.'

Matthew 19, 30 MS 347 Folio 1: բազումք եղիցին առաջինք յետինք. և յետինք առաջինք. Bazumch eglizzin, arhascinch ietinch. eu ietinch arhascinch. This passage in MS 347 has been copied in from a lost folio with many misspellings: Bazumch eglizzin, arhascinch ietinch. arhascinch. The text is missing the second phrase, and it is reasonable to think that the damage was subsequent to Ambrogio's death.

From MS 178 opinions of the Church Fathers: և միութաի յերրորդութէ˜ (յերրորդութեան), և երրորդութի˜ (երրորդութիւն) իմիութէ˜ (իմիութեան) պատուելոցիցէ. eu miuthai ierrorduthene, eu errorduthai imiuthene patuelozzizzae.

Verso 174:

At this point, Ambrogio has completed his journey through the Armenian alphabet, which he consistently compares with the mysterious Vandalic alphabet (this is a subject for a separate investigation). He now proceeds to investigate Armenian word formation, derivation and inflection: De syllabis servilibus Armenorum: Chapter XV:

He misdivides '-agoyn' and creates a comparative ending Ագոյ. Agoi, & ոյ.   oi. His examples come from Aristotle (MS 179)

Aristotle Praedicabilitas: հասարակ hasarac. հասարակագոյն. hasaracagoin. Other examples include: ձանաւթագոյն. Xanauthagoin. ընտանեգոյն. Ientanegoin. These forms are, of course, created to translate Greek grammatical forms; Ambrogio could not have guessed their artificiality although Galanus and Holov would attempt to enshrine them in the common grammar and they do have some place today as a form of learned superlative.

Matthew 27, 46 MS 347 Folio 5: He entertains the semantics of իմ. 'im': ~աձ (Աստուաձ) իմ. ~աձ իմ. Astux im, Astux im. This is a new transliteration of a very often used text in Ambrogio.

Recto 175:

John 2, MS 347 Folio: տուն Հայր իմոյ, տուն վաճառի. Tun hair imoi, tun vagarhi.

Porphyry: he has already mentioned the use of ոյր. -oir as a genitive in words such as Socratoir and Platonoir.

Aristotle Praedicabilitas: we move on to verbal morphology, the future in եաց. -Eszt-: ստորոգի. Storogi. ստորոգեացի. Storogeszti. Հետեւ. Heteu. Հետեւեացյ. Heteueszti. (Note the inappropriate use of 'y' for 'i' following Latin conventions). եացե. և եացեու. -Eszze eu -eszzes. This ending is also characteristic of the imperative: մաքրեացե. Machreszte. պարգեւեացեու. Pargeuesztes. It is evident that Ambrogio realizes a great deal of the semantics of the Armenian verb.

Luke 3, MS 347 Folio: The ending է. '-ae' is pursued: եկեացե. Ecesztae (3rd person).

Matthew 27 MS 347 Folio: փրկեացե. Pharcesztae (note the 'a' used as a schwa).

He continues into the common noun inflections and nominal abstract derivations: ութայ, -Vthai, ութիւ, -vthiu, ութաբ, -vthab, ութենե. -vthene. We have already commented upon the strange interpretation that can be given to this series: a denasalized variety of the common declension; however, there is little evidence for such a dialect and it may be that acute Ambrogio simply missed the true nature of the most common declension due to the abbreviations used.

Verso 175:

He illustrates their use with the root for 'evil' չար. zar. չարութայի. Zaruthai. (ch'aruthiwn).

Psalm: 140 (141), 4: բանիւ չարութենե. (չարութեան) Baniu Zaruthene.

Psalm 119, 68 & 102: և յ քաղցրութաբ քով. eu i caglzzuthab ch . (ew i k'ghc'ruthamb k'ov) քաղցոր. (քաղցր) Chaglzzor. քաղցրութայի. (քաղցրութիւն) Chaglzzruthai. Note the intrusive 'o' in the word 'k'aghc'r'. and the mistransliteration of many words. Clearly he does not understand the abbreviations here. We do not possess his Psalter so we cannot know if this is a manuscript form.

Psalm 145 (146), 5: ոգնական.   gnacan.

Psalm 90 (91), 1: ոգնութայի. (յոգնութեան.)   gnuthai.

Porphyry: He passes on to the prefixed particle վեր. 'Ver-': վերլուծանի. Verluxani. eu վերլուծութայի. Verluxuthai. ի վերլուծականսն. I Verluxacansn.   He cites a marginal note of Latin in Armenian script which glosses the above words: ռեզոլուդորիիս. Rhez lud riis.   վերընդունին. Veriendunin. վերելից. Verelizt.

Recto 176:

ng. -ozz is next. It has a plural significance.

Psalm 129 (130), 2: **աղոթից իմող.** Aglothizt imozt.

Matthew 27, 25 MS 347 Folio 4: **որդիոց մերող.** Ordiozt merozt.

He also looks into **զի,** 'Zi' and **ցի.** 'Tzi'. The later has many verbal and derivative functions; the former is a dependent clause marker equivalent to Latin 'ut.'

Matthew 26, 2 MS 347 Folio 150: **խաչեցի. և զի խաչեցի.** Hhazezti eu zi hhazezti. (xach'el anel)

Matthew 27, 32 MS 347 Folio 5: **կիւրենեա. կիւրենացի.** Ciurenea. Ciurenazti.

John 1: 41, 47 & 49 MS 347 Folios 9 &10: **իսրաէլ.** Israael. **իսրաէլացի.** Israaelazzi. Note that Ambrogio makes no distinction between -zt- and -zz-. **իւր,** Iur brings us to **զելբայրիւր. (զեղբայր իւր.)** Zelbairiur. (zeghbayr iwr) where the normal 'gh' is written with a light 'l' and the pronoun is merged with its preceding word. The reading in the MS agrees with the Zohrabian text; this is Ambrogio's clear miscopying.

Verso 176:

Psalm 109 (110), 2 & 3: **ծնաւ (ծնայ) զքեզ.** Xnau Zchez. **առաքեսցէ (առաքեսցէ) քեզ** Ahracheszte chez. The occasion is the exploration of Armenian **քեզ.** Chez.

His final topic is the use of the schwa **ըզ. ըն. ը.** 'Iez, ien, ie' intially, medially, and finally: **ըզպանձալոյն.** Iezpanxaloin. **տեառըն մարմնոյն.** Tearhien marmnoin. And its syllabic use when an 'i' or 'u' is lost when a word is inflected:

Porphyry: **սուպ.** Sut. **սրոէ.** Sietae. Here the added auxiliary has motivated the apocope or Ambrogio has misconstrued the meaning and we have some sort of ablative form. **՞շմարիտս գոլ.** Hismarits gol. **՞շմարիտրս գոլ մարթի,** Hismarities gol marthi.

With this last example he closes his discussion of Armenian in the *Introductio...*

Part IV: Appendix to Chapter II

Pavia MS 347 and the Zohrabian Bible: a Comparative Study

The Contents of Codex 347 'Breviarium armeniacum.' (Most properly a 'Lectionary' **ճաշոց**)

Note that the book is identified as a **Մաշտոց** but that is the name for the Armenian 'Ritual,' which this book plainly is not; things are further obscured by the claim that the book is a 'Breviary' or a **ժամագիրք**, but this is even further from the actual identity. This Codex represents a much damaged 'Lectionary and the identification should be changed in the manuscript catalogue.

The following list is an attempt to delineate the New Testament and Old Testament texts found in this 14th century Kaffa paper manuscript. We will note any missing pages when possible. The edition used is from a microfilm and the references are to folios, which will be designated recto and verso. The identification of the biblical author comes mainly from the text or from Latin glosses made by Ambrogio. Many passages were very well known and could be identified easily, while others were less so or were part of passages missing folios in the text.

Old Testament:

2 Samuel 5, 1-10	Folio 121-122r
Proverbs 10, 22-?	Folio 141 Identified as Wisdom.
Proverbs 11, 2-11	Folio 126-127r
Proverbs 2, 1-12	Folio 142-143r
Proverbs 3, 19-26	Folio 152

New Testament:

Matthew 1, 21-23	Folio 21r
Matthew 1, 7-17	Folio 75
Matthew 2, 1-23	Folio 23-25
Matthew 2, 13-14	Folio 21v
Matthew 3, 1-15	Folio 73-74
Matthew 5, 1-12	Folio 32
Matthew 5, 13-16	Folio 68
Matthew 5, 17-20	Folio 11r
Matthew 5, 17-48	Folio 99-102
Matthew 6, 1-21	Folio 94v-97r (Pater Noster)
Matthew 6, 22-24	Folio 27v
Matthew 6, 22-34; 7, 1-27	Folio 90v-94r
Matthew 9, 18-26	Folio 76
Matthew 9, 36; 10, 1-9	Folio 84-85r
Matthew 10, 16-22	Folio 33r (The Wolves among the Sheep)
Matthew 10. 1-9	Folio 67-68r
Matthew 11, 25-29	Folio 42v
Matthew 13, 51-52	Folio 58r
Matthew 16, 13-20	Folio 68v-69r
Matthew 17, 1-13	Folio 69v-70
Matthew 19, 29-30	Folio 1
Matthew 20, 29-34; 21, 1-11	Folio 58-59
Matthew 21, 12-17	Folio 48v-49r
Matthew 22, 44-46	Folio 51r
Matthew 23, 1-12	Folio 86
Matthew 23, 4-12	Folio 119
Matthew 24, 30-35	Folio 85-86r
Matthew 25, 34-46	Folio 28r-28v
Matthew 26, 19-30	Folio 150

Paul: Hebrews 11, 32-40   Folio 147-148r

Paul: Hebrews 13, 10-16   Folio 151

James 3, 5-14   Folio 146 The dangers of the tongue

1 Peter2, 1-3   Folio 152

2 Peter1, 16-19   Folio 153v

2 Peter3, 8-15   Folio 143

1 John 1, 9-10; 2, 1-2   Folio 139r

1 John 3, 2-9   Folio 139

The Troubled Text of Sirach 24:

There are a number of variant readings in MS 347 that differ from the Zohrabian Bible, yet a complete listing of these must wait for another work. Some sense of the variations can be had from the differences noted in the citations found in Ambrogio; however, I think it appropriate to give one extended example to the reader.

The following compares the various translations of Sirach 24 (the Greek is already a translation of a Hebrew original according to the Prologue). The texts are ordered according to the numbering scheme below; what is interesting is the lacunae or additions contained in the various traditions. The text from Pavia MS 347 (an Armenian Catholic 14th century Lectionary) clearly follows the Vulgate most closely, yet has significant departures from the Oskanean Bible (1666), which was translated directly from the Latin at the time of printing.

The Numbering of the Texts:

1. The Septuagint (Rahlfs): Sirach 24, 13-14 & 17-20
2. The New English Bible: Sirach 24,   13-14 & 17-22
3. The Jerusalem Bible: Sirach 24, 23-26
4. The Vulgate: Sirach 24, 17-19 & 23-31

5. Oskanean (1666): Sirach 24, 17-19 & 23-31

6. MS 347 (14th cen.): Sirach 24, 23-31

6a. Fragments of MS 347 from Ambrogio (Folios are missing from 347): Sirach
24, 17

7. Zohrabian (1805): Sirach 24, 17-19 & 22-29

8. Yerevan Theological Institute's Critical Text (1998): 17-19 & 22-29

Ambrogio's Sirach citations from MS 347 in the body of his *Introductio...*:
զկիպրի. Zcipri; ի կադես. i cades. Ambrogio Recto 159
զտուկն վարդենոյ ի երիքով. ztucn vardenoi i erich   .
Ambrogio Verso 162

1. ὡς κέδρος ἀνυψώθην ἐν τῷ λιβάνῳ

2. There I grew like a cedar of Lebanon,

4. Quasi cedrus exaltata sum in Libano,

5. Իբրև զմայր բարձրացեալ եմ ի Լիբանանու.

7. Իբրև նոճ բարձր ի Լերինն Լիբանանու:

8. Իբրեւ նոճ բարձր ի լերինն Լիբանանու:

1. καὶ ὡς κυπάρισσος ἐν ὄρεσιν Αερμων·

2. like a cypress on the slopes of Hermon,

4. Et quasi cypressus in monte Sion;

5. Եւ իբրև զսարդ ի լերինն Սիոն:

6a.   զկիպրի.

7. Եւ իբրև սարդ ի լերինն ճերմոնի:

8. Եւ իբրեւ սա՛րդ ի լերինն Ահերմոնի:

1. ὡς φοῖνιξ ἀνυψώθην ἐν Αιγγαδοις

2. like a date-palm at Engedi,

4. Quasi palma exaltata sum in Cades,

5. Իբրև արմաւենի բարձրացեալ եմ ի Կադես.

1. καὶ ὡς φυτὰ ῥόδου ἐν Ιεριχω,
2. like the roses of Jericho.
4. Et quasi plantatio rosae in Iericho.
5. Եւ իբրեւ զտունկ վարդոյ յերիքով.
6a. զտունկն վարդենոյ ի երիքով.
7. Եւ իբրեւ վարդենի նորատունկ յերիքով:
8. Եւ իբրեւ վարդենի նորատունկ յերիքով:

1. ὡς ἐλάια εὐπρεπὴς ἐν πεδίῳ,
2. I grew like a fair olive-tree in the vale,
4. Quasi oliva speciosa in campis,
5. Եւ իբրեւ ձիթենի գեղեցկագոյն ի դաշտի.
7. Եւ իբրեւ ձիթենի վայելուչ ի դաշտի:
8. Եւ իբրեւ ձիթենի վայելուչ ի դաշտի:

1. καὶ ἀνυψώθην ὡς πλάτανος.
2. or a plane-tree planted beside the water.
4. Et quasi platanus exaltata sum iuxta aquam in plateis.
5. Եւ իբրեւ բարձրացեալ զԱսու ի գնացս ջուրց ի Հրապարակի:
7. Եւ իբրեւ սաւս ի գնացս ջուրց բարձրացայ:
8. Եւ իբրեւ սաւս ի գնացս ջուրց բարձրացայ:

7. Եւ իբրեւ բեւկնի արմատացուցի զոստս իմ:
8. Եւ իբրեւ բեւեկնի արմատացուցի զոստս իմ:

1. ἐγὼ ὡς ἄμπελος ἐβλάστησα χάριν, καὶ τὰ ἄνθη μου καρπὸς
2. I put forth lovely shoots like the vine, And my blossoms were a harvest
3. I am like a vine putting out graceful shoots. My blossoms bear the fruit
4. Ego quasi vitis fructificavi suavitatem odoris; Et flores mei fructus

5. Եւ իբրև զորթ պտողաբերեցի զհամեղութիւն հոտոյ և ծաղիկ իմ պտուղ.ք

6. Եւ որպես զուռ պտողաբերցի զհոտն կենաց և ծաղիկ իմ պտուղ

1. δόξης καὶ πλούτου. εγω μητηρ της αγαπησεως της καλης, και φοβου

2. of wealth and honor. (I gave birth to noble love, reverence,

3. of glory and wealth.

4. honoris et honestatis. Ego mater pulchrae dilectionis, et timoris,

5. պատուոյ և համեստութեան: Եu մայր գեղեցիկ տարփման. և երկիւղի,

6. պատուոյ և պարկեշտութեան: Եu մայր ամբիծ սիրոյ և երկեղի

7. Ոստ.ք իմ ոստ.ք փառաց և շնորհաց:

8. Ոստ.ք իմ ոստ.ք փառաց եւ շնորիաց:

1. και γνωσεως και της οσιας ελπιδος, διδομαι ουν πασι τοις τεκνοις μου, αειγενης τοις λεγομενοις συ

2. Knowledge and holy hope; and I gave all these my eternal progeny to God's

4. Et agnitionis, et sanctae spei. In me gratia omnis viae et veritatis; In me omnis spes vitae

5. և գիտութեան և սրբոյ յուսոյ: Ինև շնորհ ա~մի ճանապարհի՝ և ճշմարտութեան: Ինև ամենյան յոյս կենաց՝ և

6. և մեծութեան և սուրբ յուսոյ: Ի յիս շնորհ.ք ամէն կենաց և

1. αυτου). προσελθετε πρός με, οἱ ἐπιθυμοῦντές μου,

2. elect.) Come to me, who desire me,

3.   Approach me, you who desire me,

4. virtutis. Transite ad me, omnes qui concupiscitis

5. զօրութեան: Առ իս անցէ.ք ամանէ.քեան՝ ոյ.ք ցանկայ.ք

6. զաւրութեան. Ընկալարո՛ւք յինէն ամենիքեան որ ցանկայք

7.   Մատիք առ իս որ ցանկայք ինե,

8.   Մատի՛ք առ իս որ ցանկայք ինեւ,

1.   τὸ γὰρ μνημόσυνόν μου ὑπὲρ τὸ μέλι γλυκύ,

2. And eat your fill of my fruit.   The memory of me is sweeter than syrup,

3. And take your fill of my fruits,   For memories of me are sweeter than honey,

4. me, Et a generationibus meis implemini; Spiritus enim meus super mel

5. ինձ. եւ ի տաճմականաց իմոց լցարո՛ւք: Զի Հոգի իմ գեր քան
                                                            զմեղր

6. ինձ եւ յազգականաց իմոց լցջիք: Շունչմ քան զմեղր

7. եւ ի պտղոյ արմտեաց իմոց լցջիք:

8. եւ ի պտղոյ արմտեաց իմոց լցջի՛ք:

1. καὶ ἡ κληρονομία μου ὑπὲρ μέλιτος κηρίον.

2. The possession of me sweeter than honey dripping from the comb.

3. Inheriting me is sweeter than the honeycomb.

4. dulcis, Et haereditas mea super mel et favum.

5. քաղցր. եւ ժառանգութիւն իմ ի վեր քան զմեղր եւ զխորիսխ:

6. քաղցր. եւ ժառանգութիւն իմ քան զմեղր եւ զխորիս:

1.   οἱ ἐσθίοντές με ἔτι πεινάσουσιν,

2.   Whoever feeds on me will be hungry for

                                    more,

3.   They who eat me will hunger for more,

4. Memoria mea in generationes saeculorum. Qui edunt me adhuc

5. Յիշատակ իմ յազգս յաւիտենից: Որք ուտեն զիս, եւս

6. Յիշատակ իմ յազգսրն յաւիտեանից: Որք ուտեն յինեն ոչ

7. Յիշատակ իմ ազգէ յազգ.

8. Յիշատակ իմ ազգէ յազգ.

1. καὶ οἱ πίνοντές με ἔτι διψήσουσιν.

2. And whoever drinks from me will thirst for more.

3. They who drink me will thirst for more.

4. esurient, Et qui bibunt me adhuc sitient Qui

5. քաղցիցին. և ոյք ըմպեն զիս,ևևս ծարաւիցին. Որ

6. քաղցիցեն. և որք ըմպեն յինեն ոչ ծարաւեսցին: և որք

7.   և որ ըմպեն յինէն՝ դարձեալ փափագեսցեն յիս:

8.   եւ որ ըմբեն յինէն՝ դարձեալ փափաքեսցին յիս:

1. ὁ ὑπακούων μου οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσεται, καὶ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι ἐν ἐμοὶ
                                        οὐχ ἁμαρτήσουσιν.

2. To obey me is to be safe from disgrace, Those who work in wisdom will not
                                        go astray.

3. Whoever listens to me will never have to blush, Whoever acts as I dictate
                                        will never sin.

4. audit me non confundetur, Et qui operantur in me non peccabunt;

5. լսէ ինձ, ոչ ամաչէ. և որք գործեն ինև, ոչ մեղանչեն:

6. լուիցեն ինձ ոչ ամաչեսցեն. և որք գործեն յիս ոչ
                                        մեղանչեն:

4. Qui elucidant me vitam aeternam habebunt.

5. Ոյք պայծառացուցանեն զիս, զկեանս յաւիտենականս
                                        ստասցին:

6. Որք լուսաւորեսցին յինև կեանս յաւիտենականս կալցին:

Afterword

We have examined each of the Armenian citations made by Teseo Ambrogio and Guillaume Postel, while we have given a generous selection of the materials found in Rivola.

Ambrogio's synchronic presentation of a diachronic linguistic situation (he used texts from different communities, traditions and periods) may have influenced the later Catholic missionary conviction that the Armenian language needed regularization and standardization along the lines of Latin. Nonetheless, he also presented the Renaissance world with a very familiar territory in a very unfamiliar garb (the Armenian language and alphabet).

It may seem trivial today, but the form and shape of the written word had profound meaning for the Ancient, Medieval and Renaissance world. Early printing was still immersed in this World of significant irregularities that were native to the uniqueness of the manuscript; only a

century of book making would finally impress readers and authors with the importance of regulation and comparative standardization: tables, alphabetization, and indices were not automatically recognized as the innovative tools that printing made available to all (Ong a.). Ironically, this world of the unstandardized was also profoundly ahistorical, so that our interest in time-laden variation was hardly considered by the scholars of the day.

Ambrogio's task was to set out the commonalities of Christian communities divided by language and alphabets; he did this with remarkable precision, and it became the task of other, later scholars, to emphasize the profound differences that separated supposedly Christian brothers.

In conclusion, Ambrogio's world view may be clarified by reference to a dichotomous classification of scholarship found in a history of Renaissance printing. Butler notes that there are crucial differences between the antiquarian and the historian: one collects facts for themselves, while the other uses the facts collected to create an interpretational diagram of the past's reality (Butler). As we examine Ambrogio's table of contents we realize that he was better placed on the antiquarian side of the continuum connecting these two world views; it was the nature of his times that the antiquarian approach predominated, yet it is that very antiquarian material collected that allows the later historian (a Gibbon for instance) to proceed. (Butler, Grafton, Cowe)

Bibliography

The books and articles listed below frequently include my annotations, especially if the book is rare and unlikely to be found in any other library. If I had copied down the shelf number in use at the Vatican Library or the Corviana in Budapest, I include it in the citation. Incunables may be mentioned more than once if found in different libraries or if editions differ. A number of books here have not been directly cited in my text, but do provide important background material; every effort has been made to make this bibliography as exhaustive as possible.

Աբրահամյան, Ա. Գ. (1973) *Հայոց Գիր և Գրչություն*, Երևան

Աճառյան, Հ. (1946) *Հայոց Անձնանունների Բառարան*, (Ա-Ե հատոր), Երևան.

Աճառյան, Հր. (1971) *Հայերէն Արմատական Բառարան*, Ա-Դ
ֆահոր, Երևան

Adontz, Nicholas, (1970) *Denys de Thrace et les commentateurs arméniens*, Louvain.

Ahrweiler, H. ed. (1996) *L'Arménie et Byzance*, Sorbonne.

Ajamian, S. and M. E. Stone (1992) *Text and Context: Studies in the Armenian   New Testament*, University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies no. 13.

Aland, Kurt (1972) *Synopsis of the Four Gospels*, Stuttgart.

Aland, Kurt, et al ed. (1983) *The Greek New Testament* , Stuttgart.

Ալիշանեան, Լ. (1895) *հայբուսակ*, Վենետիկ.

Ambrogio Teseo, *Introductio in Chaldaicum linguam, Syriacam atque Armenicam et decem a lias linguas, characterum differentium Alphabeta circiter quadraginta,et eorumdem i nvicem conformatio;   mystica et chabalistica quamplurima scitu digna. Et descriptio ac simulachrum Phagoti Afrani*. Teseo Ambrosio ex Comitibus Albonesii   J. U. Doct. Papien. Canonico Regulari Lateranensi, ac Sancti Petri in Coelo Aureo Papiae Praeposito, Authore. MDXXXIX. (Teseo)

Amélineau, M. E. (1887) *Essai sur le gnosticisme égyptien ses développements et son origine égyptienne*, Paris.

Argelati, Philippi (1745) (Bononiensis), *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Mediolanensium* (Milanese), Tomi Secundi Pars Altera: Additus: Clarissimi Viri Josephi Antonii Saxii, Collegii S .S. Ambrosii, & Caroli Oblati, necnon Bibliotheca Ambrosianae Praefecti,   Historia

literario-Typographica Mediolensis ab anno MCDLXV (1465) ad   annum <u>md</u> nunc primum edita. VL: Bibliografia Folio 18 (1-4).

Mantissa (addendum to the addition containing a letter to Sassi from the Bishop of Brescia, Angelus Maria Quirinus, and a letter from Sassi to Quirinus. Both are descriptions of the Brescian and Pavian productions of Oriental books.)

Column 12 The bishop notes that AT's book was of great note not   only in Italy but throughout Europe--he restored the Oriental   Languages to the Continent.   Also, a Brescian, the father of Alessandro Paganini (the first printer of the Quran) was largely responsible for the fonts used by AT.

He quotes Johannus Schelhorn from Tome XIII of his Amoenit. Literatur. where he refers to Johan Albert Widmanstetter meeting AT in 1529 when Charles V was crowned (in Bologna as already noted?). He also writes of Postel.

The Brescian, Alessandro Paganini, had published an Arabic Quran and Theseus procured one for Postel, who used it principally in his Arabic Grammar. (Postel writes a letter to Theseus to which Theseus attaches a note: that it is all due to Alex. Paganinus, who formed the font in Punic letter, which I will make over to Postel for his little book of examples of types in 12 different languages.

Column 52 Sassi writes the bishop praising Theseus and notes his   letter from Afranus Canonicum   Ferrarienses to his father (Afranus created the phagotus).

Column 53 He notes a Dictionarum & Grammar Armeno-Latina by Francisco Rivola at the Ambrosiana.

Arndt, W. F. and F. W. Gingrich, (1957) *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, University of Chicago.

Arutˇnova-Fidanån, V. A. (1994) *Armåno-Vizantijskaå   Kontaktnaå Zona (10-11 vv.)* , Moskva. The basic work on the   Chalcedonian Armenians.

Աստուածաշունչ (1929) American Bible Society, Vienna.

Առձեռն Բառարան հայկազնեան Լեզուի, (1865), Վենետիկ

Աղայան, Է. Բ. (1963) *Լեզվաբանութեան Ներածութիւն*, Երեվան.

Baarda, Tjitze (1975) *The Gospel Quotations of Aphrahat the Persian Sage: Aphrahat's Text of the Fourth Gospel*, Amsterdam.

Baars, W. (1968) *New Syro-Hexaplaric Texts*, Leiden.

Balard, M. (1992) 'Byzance et les régions septentrionales de la mer Noire   (XIIIe-XVe siècles),' *Revue Historique*, Tome CCLXXXVIII/1 pp. 19-38.

Բառարան Մայր Գրոց, (1881), Constantinople.

Bellosi, Giuseppe, *L'altra lingua.* VENLR: Alb. 3833.

'Ben Sira,' *Encyclopedia Judaica*, Vol. 4 B, Jerusalem.

Bible in Arabic (1979) Cairo.

Biblia Hebraica cum Vulgata (1838) Leipzig.

Biblia Sacra iuxtaVulgatam Clementinam, (1946) Rome.

Biographie Universelle (Michaud) I p. 569. VL: Biografia   III 2 cons.
    p. 569 Ambrogio: At five months he spoke and at five years wrote   Italian, Latin and Greek. In 1512 at the Fifth Latean Council he met   Marionite and Syrian delegates (Mercoti also mentions David the Armenian from Antioch) and began the study of Syriac (Arabic and Armenian?).

After the destruction of Pavia by the French in 1527, he went to Venice where he met Postel. His Syriac Psalter was never printed.

Vol. 44 Widmanstetter: 1506-1557, New Testament in Syriac printed in Vienna 1555; met Ambrogio teseo in 1529 when Charles V was crowned.

Birnbaum, Marianna (1985) *Humanists in a Shattered World: Croatian and Hungarian Latinity in the Sixteenth Century*, Slavica.

Bolognesi, Giancarlo, (1988) 'La stratificazione del lessico armeno nell'opera di J. J. Schroeder,' *Energeia und Ergon*, Band II, Tuebingen, pp. 561-571.

Borst, Arno, (1957-63) *Der Turmbau von Babel: Geschichte der Meinungen ueber Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Voelker,* Stuttgart, 4   vol. PBI: XXVII 4W 3.1/4.

Bouwsma, William J., (1957)*Concordia Mundi: The Career and Thought of Guillaume Postel (1510-1581)*, Harvard: Cambridge, Mass.

Boyle, L. E. (1994) *'The Ways of Prayer of Saint Dominic*: Notes on MS Rossi 3   in the Vatican Library,' *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum,* LXIV pp. 7-17.

Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, (1959) *Hebrew and English Lexicon   of he Old Testament*, Oxford.

Brun, J. (1911) *Dictionarium Syriaco-Latinum*, Beryti Phoeniciorum.

Buber, Martin (1964) *Tales of the Hasidim; The Early Masters*, Schoken.

Bucaille, M. (1982) *The Bible. the Qur'an and Science: the Holy Scriptures Examined in the Light of Modern Knowledge*, Paris. An attempt to   explain the differences between the Bible and the Quran based upon the findings of modern science.

Burchard, C. ed. (1993) *Armenia and the Bible*, Armenian Texts and Studies, Pennsylvania.

Burn, A. E. (1899) *An Introduction to the Creeds and to the Te Deum*, London.

Butler, Pierce, (1940) *The Origins of Printing in Europe*, The University of Chicago Press.

Camilli, Amerindo, (1965) *Pronuncia e grafia dell'italiano*.   (VL?)VENLR: F. Falqui M 8922/ 220.B.469.

Canepari, Luciano, (1980) *Italiano standard e pronunce regionali*, Padova.   VENLR: AMB 1215.

Cappelli, A. (1967) *Dizionario di Abbreviature Latine ed Italiane*, Milan.

Carruthers, Mary (1990) *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval   Culture*, Cambridge. This is a groundbreaking work that emphasizes the difference in common academic consciousness when memory was at least as important as the book and the library: Aquinas dictated from memory, for example. The scarcity of books required that they be read aloud and often shared by oral means from memory. Memory was a component of all thinking and was viewed as an active and shaping component.

Charles, R. H. (1968) *The Apocrypha and Pseudoepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, Vols. I & II, Oxford.

Cherkesi, E. (1950) *Georgian-English DIctionary*, Oxford.

Cittadini, Celso (1555-1627) *Lingua Italiana*, VL: Ferraioli   V 608. Sienese; original 1625; Vatican copy ed. 1721.
        Della Volgare Lingua: pp. 30-35; pp. 72-75.

      pp. 111-131 Trattato degli Articoli; pp. 297-311. (see xerox)

Clackson, J. (1994) *The Linguistic Relationship Between Armenian and Greek*, Blackwell.

Codices 178, 179. 346 and 347: the Library of the University of Pavia.

Codex 186 della Biblioteca Alessandrina: the library of the Un. of Rome; Marco Palma (professor of paleography); Giovanni Rita is the conservator.The manuscript is a hand written Latin translation of the Syriac liturgy with some mention of the Armenian liturgy; there are no attestations of either Syriac or Armenian in the original script or transliteration.

Collinge, N. E. editor, *An Encyclopaedia of Language,* Routledge, London, 1990.

Colomiès, Paul (1638-1692), *Italia & Hispania Orientalis*, p.37. VL: Racc. Gen. Neolatini VI 22; Racc. Gen. Storia V 778 (2); Racc. Gen. Bibbia V 797 (int. 1); Ferraioli V 5092.

Contarini, Pietro, Veneziano. Racc. Gen. Lett. It. V 1438; Racc. Gen. Enc-Diz. V 56.

Contini, Riccardo (1993) 'I primordi della linguistica semitica commarata nell'Europa rinascimentale: le *Institutiones linguae Syriacae, Assyriacae atque Thalmudicae, una cum Aethiopicae, atque Arabicae collatione....* di Angelo Canini (1554),' Unpublished paper given at a Conference of the University of Venice.

Conybeare, F. C. (1892) 'A Collation with the Ancient Armenian Version of the Greek Text of Aristotle's *Categories, De Interpretatione, De Mundo*, and *De Virtutibus et Vitis* and of Porphyry's *Introduction*,' *Anecdota Oxoniensia.*

Copelston, F. (1960) *A History of Philosophy*, Vols. I-VII, Doubleday

Costaz, L. (1955) *Grammaire Syriaque*, Beyrouth.

Cowe, P. (1992) *The Amenian Version of Daniel*, Armenian Texts and Studies 9, Pennsylvania.

Cowe, Peter (1991) 'An Elizabethan Armeno-Latin Wordlist and the Inception of Armenian Studies in England,' *Le Muséon*, Tome 104-Fasc. 3-4, pp. 277-333. This English cleric deciphered an Armenian liturgical manuscript without any prior knowledge of the language. His methods are illuminating and follow those of Ambrogio quite closely.

Cox, Claude E. (1986) *LXX: Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version*, Scholars Press, Atlanta.

Cox, C. E. (1978) 'Bible, Armenian,' in Harry Weber ed. *The modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet Literature*, 2 Academic International Press, pp. 239-244.

Daniel, N. (1960) *Islam and the West*, Edinburgh

Daniel-Rops (1953) *La Bible Apocryphe*, Paris.

Dannenfeldt, Karl H., (1955) `The Renaissance Humanists and the Knowledge of Arabic', *Studies in the Renaissance*, Vol. II, pp. 96- 117.

Dauzat, A. (1925) *Les Noms de Personnes: Origine et Évolution*, Paris.

De Marchi, L. & Bertolani, G. (1894) *Inventario dei Manoscritti della R. Biblioteca Universitaria di Pavia*, Vol. I & II, Milan.

de Rosinis, C. (1649), *Lycei Lateranensis illustrium scriptorum...elogia Cesenae* II pp. 312-318. VL: Cl Barberini Z IV 55-56.

Dee, John (1986) *The Heptarchia Mystica*, The Aquarian Press.

DeFrancis, J. (1984) *The Chinese Language: Fact and Fantasy*, Honolulu.

Delamarre, X., (1984) *Le vocabulaire Indo Europeen: lexique etymologique thematique*, Librairie d'Amerique et Orient, Adrien Maisonneuve, 11   rue St- Sulpice, Paris.

Demonet-Launay, Marie-Luce, (1993) A book on the Hebrew origins of all scripts, Geneva.

Devoto, G. & G. Giacomelli (1972) *I Dialetti delle Regioni d'Italia*, Firenze.

Devoto, G. *La lingua italiana*. VENLR: Coll. It. 50/172 bis.

Devoto, Giacomo, *Il linguaggio d'Italia.* VENLR: Coll. It. 2432/113; AEB. 394.

Diringer, D. (1953) *The Book Before Printing: Ancient, Medieval and Oriental*, Dover.

Diringer, David, (1937) *L'alfabeto nella storia della civiltà*, Firenze pp. xxxix-xl. The roman numerals refer to a preface written by Guido Mazzoni. He is mistaken in his references to AT. He assumes that AT calls Ethiopic Chaldaic (this is actually a reference to the Potken Psalter of 1512 as explained by Levi Della Vida on p. 325 of his book above: Postel and AT always refer to Ethiopic as Indic).

Dizionario biographico degli Italiano, vol. II, pp 39-42 (Diz).

Drevnegruzinskie Redak†ii Psaltyri, (1960) 1. Tekst,   Tbilisi.

Eberto, Teodoro, (1628) *Elog. Jurisconsultor, & Politicorum centum qui   literas Orientis calverunt*, pp. 8-9. Professor of Hebrew at Lipsiae

Enciclopedia Cattolica X pp. 1-2. VL: Encic. III 7 cons.

Enzyklopaedie des Islam, Band IV S-Z, Leiden 1934. Tabriz pp. 631-642. (see xerox on Tabriz, Kurds, and Armenians.)
Library of Marquart came to Pontifical Biblical Institute through son of Akhmatova, Gumielov [sic?] (who wrote In Search of Prester John and holds strange notions of the benefits of the   Tartarization of Russia). All of Marquart's Armenian and Iranian manuals and references are interleaved so that he could write his commentaries. As an example,
Huebschmann, H., Armenische Grammatick, I Theil: Armenische   Etymologie, Leipzig, 1897 has 84 annotations by Marquart in sections   V, Armenische Lehnwoerter unsicher Herkunft, and V, Echtarmenische Woerter, alone.
It would be a worthy project to publish these etymologies in a seperate paper or fascicle: from Horn, Huebschmann, Acharian, etc.

Endreichio, Cristoforo, Pandect. Brandenburg. p. 146.

Էփրիկեան, Ս. (1901) *Բնաշխարհիկ բառարան*, ՎԵՆԵՏԻԿ, Ա-Թ.

Ervine, Roberta, (1995) 'Yovhannes Erznkac'i Pluz's *Compilation of Commentary on Grammar* as a Starting Point for the Study of Medieval Grammars,' in *New Approaches to Medieval Armenian Language and Literature*, ed. J. J. S. Weitenberg, Rodopi: Amsterdam pp.149-165.

Feydit, F., (1982) *Considérations sur l'alphabet se Saint Mesrop et recherches sur la phonétique de l'Armenien*, Wien.

Forbath, P. (1977) *The River Congo*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston. The book's second chapter is the best treatment of the African Prester John myth.

Frazee, Charles A. (1983) *Catholics and Sultans: the Church and the Ottoman Empire 1453-1923*, Cambridge.

Fumagelli, G. (1949) *Lexicon typographicum Italiae*, (Florence 1905) 3rd ed. pp. 292-293

Funk, R. W. (1961) *A Greek grammar of the New Testament*, Cambridge University.

Galano, Clemente, (1645) *Grammaticae et Logicae Institutiones Linguae Literalis Armenicae,* Romae.

Galanus, Clemens, (1645) *Grammaticae et Logicae Institutiones Linguae Literalis Armenicae Armenis Traditae*, Romae, Ex Typographia Sacrae Congreg. de Propaganda Fide. (in Armenian and Latin on facing pages of the same folio.)

Gamkrelidze, Thomas, (1994) *Alphabetic Writing and the Old Georgian Script,* Caravan Books, NY.

Gandillac, Maurice de (1943) *Oeuvres complètes du Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite*, Paris.

Gehl, P. (1987) 'Cometens Silentium: Varieties of Monastic Silence in the Medieval West,' *Viator*, Vol. 18, pp. 125-160.

Gehl, P. (1994) 'Preachers, Teachers, and Translators: The Social Meaning of Language Study in Trecento Tuscany,' *Viator*, Vol. 25, pp. 289-323.

Gehl, Paul, (1993) *A Moral Art: Grammar and Society in Trecento Florence*, Cornell University Press.

Geiger, Ludwig, (1871) *Johann Reuchlin: sein Leben und seine Werke*, Leipzig. VL: Racc. Gen. IV 2014.

Gelb, I. J. (1952) *A Study of Writing*, Chicago.

Լուկասյան, Բ. (1974) *Ութսան Երեւանցի Պատմաբելա 1638- 167⅍*, Երեւան. This is a fictive account of the Armenian New Julfan typographers in Europe during the 17th century.

Giustiniani, Agostino (1516) *Psalterium Hebraeum, Graecum, Arabicum, et Chaldaeum, cum tribus Latinis interpretationibus et glossis*, Genoa. The book is the primary resource for Ambrogio's Semitic examples from the Psalms. Ambrogio refers to him as the Archbishop of Nebbio, a city in Corsica.

Gordon, Cyrus, Review of Bernal in JAOS Volume 113 Number 1 Jan-March 1993. Very positive.
He also notes his paper in Festschrift of Prince Mikasa of Japan: Near Eastern Studies (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz), 1991 pp. 56-62, where he claims to definitively show that Eteo-Cyprian and Cretan are Semitic languages.

Goshen-Gottstein, M. H. (1970) *A Syriac-English Glossary with Etymological Notes*, Wiesbaden.

Graf, G. (1944-53) *Geschichte der Christlichen Arabischen Literatur*, Five Volumes, the Vatican.

Grafton, Anthony, (1992) *New Worlds, Ancient Texts*, Harvard University Press. A powerful argument for the slow assimilation of the new information of the discoveries in the New World because of the interference of the Ancient Texts.

Greim, Barbara, (1983) `The Elliptical Idiom: Change from Icon and Index to Symbol,' in Irmengard, Rauch and G. Carr, *Language Change,* Indiana University Press pp. 1-9.

Greppin, J. & A. Khachaturian (1986) *A Handbook of Armenian Dialectology*, New York.

Gryson, Roger ed. (1994) *Biblia Sacra Vulgata,* Stuttgart.

Gvarjaladze, Thamar & Isidore (1975) *English-Georgian Dictionary*, Tbilisi.

Ճամբարբատ ճիՆ և Նոր ԿտակարաՆաց, (1895), Jerusalem.

Hambartsoumian, Vazgen (1994) 'The Periodization of the History of Latinized Armenian,' Unpublished paper given at a Conference in Montreal.

Harris, Roy (1986) *The Origin of Writing*, Open Court, Illinois. Prof. Harris makes a very strong argument for finding the origins of writing in numeration rather than language transcription: the need to record numbers leads to the insights that allow the recording of speech. This conception adds weight to Gamkrlidze's point that the use of alphabets as numbering systems maintained the received order of the letters, which order was then canonized and explained by other means.

Hastings, J. ed. (1921) 'Syrian Christians,' *Encyclopedia of Religion and   Ethics,* Edinburgh.

Hastings, James (1961) *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Edinburgh.

Hatch, E. and H. A. Redpath (1954) *A Concordance to the Septuagint and   other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, Graz-Austria.

Ճայ ճՆատիկ Գրքի ՄատեՆագիտակաՆ Ցուցակ 1512-1806, (1963), երևաՆ

Հայ Ճնատիպ գրքի Մատենագիտական Ցուցակ 1512-1806, Երևան.

Հայաստան և շրջակայ երկրներ (Ա-Դ 1985; Ե-Կ 1988), Երևան.

Հայաստանի Կենսաբանական Հանդես, (1990), թիվ 4, Երևան

Հայրապետյան, Ս. Պ. (1988) *Հայոց Հին և Միջնադարյան Գրականության Պատմություն*, Երևան.

Huebschmann, Heinrich, (1972) *Armenische grammatik*, Hildesheim.

Ittig, Thomas (1704) *Exercitatio historico-theologica*..., Lipsiae Life of Postel and list of his printed and manuscript works. Hungarian National Library (HNL): 227.269

Ջահուկյան, Գ. (1987) *Հայոց Լեզվի Պատմություն*, Երևան.

Ջահուկյան, Գ. Բ. (1972) *Հայ Բարբառագիտության Ներածություն*, Երևան

Ջահուկյան, Գ. Բ. (1974) *Գրաբարի Քերականության Պատմություն* , Երևան

Jellicoe, Sidney (1968) *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, Oxford.

Jensen, H. (1970) *Sign, Symbol and Script*, London.

Jounel, P. ed. (1981) *Missel du Dimanche*, Paris.

Kevorkian, Raymond. (1986) Catalogue des "Incunables" armeniens (1511-1695), Chronique de l'Imprimerie armenienne, Geneve.

Kévorkian, R. H. ed. (1996) *Arménie entre Orient et Occident*, Paris.

Kittel, Rudolf, ed. (1950) *Biblia Hebraica*, Stuttgart.

Koriun, (1964) *The Life of Mashtots*, AGBU of America.

Kuntz, Marion, (1981)*Guillaume Postel: Prophet of the Restitution of All   Things; His Life and Thought,* Martinus Nijhoff: the Hague.

Launay, M., (1981) 'Le *De originibus* de 1538: une rhétorique des origines,' in *Guillaume Postel 1581-1981*, Paris

Lepschy, Guilio, (1990) Storia della Linguistica, vol. 1 & 2, il Mulino, (vol 2 has essay by M. Tavoni on Renaissance Linguistics, PBI: XXVII 1 R 25.1.

Leslau, W. (1946) Bibliography of Semitic Languages of Ethiopia, NY Public Library, p. 18

Leslau, Wolf, (1965) An Annotated Bibliography of the Semitic Languages of Ethiopia, Mouton. VL: Bibliografia II Africa Ethiopia 2 cons.

Levi Della Vida, G., (1960) Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani, Rome, pp. 39-41. (see xerox).

Levi Della Vida, Giorgio, (1939) Ricerche sulla formazione del più antico   dei manoscritti orientale della Biblioteca Vaticana, Biblioteca Vaticana. VL: Coll. Gen. I   45 (92) cons.
pp. 37-38 Teseo's help in the acquisition of a Samaritan alphabet.

p. 80 Joannes Albertus Widmestadius (footnote 1) Briefly AT's student at Reggio Emilia.

p. 98 That AT went to Rome to use the Vatican manuscripts in 1512. Footnote 1 refers to David Diringer below.

pp. 132-135 AT and the Syriac manuscripts.

p. 139 Postel (140) Chaldiaca=Judeo-Aramaic.

p. 141 Ambrogio and Widmanstetter meet in Bologna 1529.

p. 144 Postel was the main editor of Widmanstetter's Syriac New   Testament.

pp. 307-308 Postel introduced Arabic studies to Europe.

pp. 308-327 Postel's Arabic manuscript acquisitions: he makes many mistakes in Arabic transcription into Latin, cf. p. 317 footnote 1.

p. 320 footnote 2 Librorum Punicorum refers to Arabic Maghrebi script in both Postel and AT.

p. 325 footnote 1 Postel's example of Ethiopic are still noted as Indiana following AT and against `caldaica' of Giovanni Potken's 1513 Roman edition of the Psalter.

p. 216 Leonardo Abel was a Maltese bishop who collected oriental   manuscripts for the Vatican. His translator and secretary was an Armenian, Tommaso, translator of the New Testament into Persian. Levi Della Vida refers to a short confession of faith in the collection Vat. Ar. 1492: Michael, the Melekite Archbishop writes a reference to this Tommaso in Arabic (LDV believes it is Michael's hand) } Ãæä } ¿øf ~ £ø¬Ü f   ö , for poor Thomas the   Armenian from Aleppo, then in Latin, Tomas de Angelis Armenus (LDV says this is in Abel's hand). Footnote notes Abel's two line transcription of Thomas's confession of faith in Armenian script. Abel apparently could read Armenian.

R. Contini notes that Levi Della Vida mentions three or four words in Kurdish written in Syriac script; I could not find it referred to in the   very substantial index under `kurd' etc. I must ask Contini for further references.

Liddell, H. G., R. Scott (1968) *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford.

Lombordelli, Crazio, (1568) Della pronunzia toscana. VL: Capponi V 611 int. 2. pp. 2-31.
     (second work bound in the volume). (see xerox)

Lovarini, Emilio, Padovan dialect. VL: Lingua Roman. Italiano Collem 3 69 (1) cons.

Markwart, Jos. (1917) *Ueber das Armenische Alphabet*, Wien.

Մաշտոց (1988) Անթիլիաս.

Mattei, Loreto, Pronunzia. VL: Racc. It. V 421

Mauro, M. A., Studi sopra suoni rappresentati. VL: Ferraioli V 7385.

Mayerson, Philip, (1993) `A Confusion of Indias: Asian India and African   India in the
     Byzantine Sources', *JAOS* Volume 113 Number 1 Jan-March 1993, pp. 169-174.
     p. 169 Ammianus Marcellinus 330-395 and Procopius of Caesarea   (500-565) called
     the South Asian territories India, but Procopius refers to the Nile flowing out of India
     (Axum) to Egypt in Bldgs. 6.1.6.--so we have one reference to an Ethiopian India.
     p.170 India Maior--India (land of silks including China) and India   Minor--Ethiopia
     (Axum and South Arabia) are more commonly found in 4th century texts:
     p. 171 Rufunus (345-410) has Matthew proselytize Ethiopia and Bartholomew
     citerior India (nearby India). There was also ulterior India. Socrates (380-450)
     follows Rufinus. Gelasius Cyzicus (fl. 475) confuses Indias, but has Matthew preach
     to the Parthians and Thomas to Greater (Asian) India. Athanasius (295-373), the
     Bishop of Alexandria, says that Frumentius went to Axum, further India, and
     became Bishop.
     p. 172 Nearer India (Rufinus) is Arabia Felix. The Arian Philostorgius (368-430/40)
     tells of Constantius sending Theophilus to Arabia Magnus: Indians are called
     Sabaeans.
     p. 173 John of Malalas (491-578) has the battle between the Axumites and Homorites
     (Himyarites) happen in India, Saracen India.

p. 173 The problem also exists in Aramaic, Hebrew and Syriac: Rabbi Yehudah Hinduah (cited in the Babylonian Talmud, Kiddushim 22b)   comes from Ethiopia.

Մայր Ցուցակ ճայերէն Հեռագրաց (1984) Երևան.

Mazzachelli, Giammaria (1753) *Gli scrittori d'Italia I ii Brescia* CICICCCLIII   pp. 608-611 Vatican Library (VL): Folio 14 1-7 cons. Short life of AT. (see xerox)

McKeon, R. ed. (1957) *Selections from the Medieval Philosophers*, Vol. I,   Scribners.

Meillet, A. (1913) *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg.

Mercati, Giovanni, (1897-1906) Ambrogio Teseo primo traduttore e raccoglitore di liturgie orientali, Studi e Testi 77 MCMXXXVII Opera Minori Vol. II. Description of the first European printing of a Syriac Liturgy in Ambrogio Teseo.

Mercier, Charles, (1978) 'L'école hellénistique dans la littérature arménienne,' *REA* XIII, pp. 59-75.

Metcalf (1974) `The Indo-European Hypothesis in the 16th and 17th Centuries.'   pp. 233-257, in D. H. Hymes ed.*Studies in the History of Linguistics: Traditions and Paradigms*, Indiana University Press.

Metcalf, George, (1980) 'Theodor Bibliander (1504-1564) and the   Languages of Japheth's Progeny,' in *Historiographia Linguistica* VII:3, pp. 323-333.

Metzger, Bruce, (1977)*The Early Versions of the New Testament*, Oxford.

Migliorini, B. (1987) *Storia della Lingua Italiana*, Firenze.

Migliorini, Bruno, (1984.) *The Italian Languge,* VENLR: ATB 1004/   SS.80(08)G83/5.

Milani, F. & Angelo Stella (1985) *Parlà 'd Varlaeca: lingua e dialetto a Pavia dal '300 al ' 900*, Logos International. This work samples and comments on the actual phonology of the language spoken in the locale of Pavia from 1300-1900. It clarifies the manner in which Ambrogio himself may have pronounced all of his languages, especially Latin and Italian.

Minassian, M. (1986) *Synopse des évangiles en Arménien classique*, Geneva.

Mirzoån, G. K. (1988) «Klement Galanos i armånskaå logiceskaå   myslh»   *Voprosy Filosofii*, Erevan, 122-131.

Mondésert, C. (1984) *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible,* Paris.

Moscati, S. ed. (1969) *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages: Phonology and Morphology*, Wiesbaden.

Mouraviev, S. (1980) 'Les caractères Daniéliens,' *REArm* XIV pp. 55-111.

Movsessian, P. L. (1959) *Armenische Grammatik: West-, Ost-, und Altarmenisch*, Wien.

Mozeson, I. E. (1989) *The Word: the Dictionary that Reveals the Hebrew   Sources of English*, New Jersey. The author clearly argues that Hebrew, God's language, underlies all others. Occasionally, he hits upon a clearly evident case without understanding the implications: e.g. Horus is the Greek form of an Egyptian word, but it has clear connections with Hebrew because both Hebrew and Coptic/Egyptian are members of the Afro-Asiatic Family of languages (this he does not understand) p.92.

Müller, Max, (1907) *Widmanstetter, 1506-1557, Sein Leben und   Werken*..., Bamberg, Handel-Druckerei. VL: Racc. Gen. Vitae IV 1660. (see xerox)

Nersessian, Vrej (1980) *Catalogue of Early Armenian Books 1512-1850*, The British Library.

Nersessian, Vrej (1991) 'Bernhard von Breydenbach's *Peregrinatio in Terram Sanctam* and its Significance for the History of Armenian Printing,' *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 5 (1990-1991) pp. 91-102.

Nestle, E., (1904) Aus einem sprachwissenschaftlichen Werk von   1539,   Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen   Gesellschaft, LVIII. VL: Racc. Gen. Misc. III. 666 (4) (5-7). (see xerox)

Nichanian, Marc, (1989) *Ages et usages de la langue arménienne*, Paris.

Նոր Բառագիրք Հայկազեան Լեզուի, (1979), Երևան

Նոր Կտակարան (1991) Էջմիածին.

Nouvelle biographie générale, II p. 326 Same entry as above. VL: Biografia III 4 cons.

Novum Testamentum Latine (1868) Berlin.

Nuovo, Angela (1987) 'l Corano arabo ritrovato,' *La Bibliofilia*, pp. 237-271.

Ó Mathúna, S. P. (1986) *William Bathe S.J.,1564-1614: A Pioneer in Linguistics*, Benjamins.

Oesterley, W. O. E. (1946) *An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha*, London.

Ong, Walter (1982) *Orality and Literacy*, London. Ong is one of the first scholars to emphasize the changes wrought by the physical nature of the book in different

times and conditions. Moreover, he recognizes that   the book among the few was heavily influenced by the oral consciousness of the many: something that 19th century universal education has sharply changed. (Ong a.)

Ong, Walter (1967) *The Presence of the Word*, Yale. This work contains Ong's famous distinction between Mother (oral) and Father (literate) tongues: for centuries these were usually different languages. They were learned in different circumstances and by different means for clearly different purposes. (Ong b.)

Ong, Walter (1977) *Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture*, Cornell. Here the author explores the slow realization of the many differences between the manuscript and the   printed book. Early printed works were often changed with each imprint as if they were manuscripts. The many advantages of similitude were not appreciated for almost half a century after the printing press appeared in every city of Europe. When every copy is the same, then an index, table of contents, concordance, etc. becomes not only possible, but also   useful. The book becomes the first instance of the   understanding of the importance   of standardization for industry and bureaucracy, public and private. (Ong c.)

Ուկանյան, Ն., Ք. Կորկուտյան, Ա. Սավալյան (1988) *Հայ Գիրքը 1512-1800 Թվականներին*, Երևան.

Osservazioni Litterarie (Verona) Tome II p. 14. VL: Racc. Gen. Periodici V 14.

Oudenrijn, Marcus Antonius (1960)*Linguae Haicanae Scriptores*, Bern. The most complete examination of Catholic Armenian literary and liturgical manuscripts. It also contains through the centuries.

Oudenrijn, M. A. (1956-1962) 'Uniteurs et Dominicains d'Arménie,' *OrChr*, 40 pp.94-112; 42 pp. 110-133; 43 pp. 11-119; 45 pp. 95-109; 46 pp. 99-116.

Ottley, R. R. (1914) *The Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge.

Owens, J. (1988) *The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory*, Benjamins.

Owens, J. (1990) *Early Arabic Grammatical Theory: Heterogeneity and Standardization*, Benjamins.

Palandjian, H. (1993) *Wortformenindex der Psalmen im Armenischen*, Munich.

Palandjian, H. (1997) *Word-Index to the New Testament Acts and Letters*, Quebec.

Pankhurst, R. (1977) 'The Armenians and Ethiopia,' *Revue des Études arméniennes,* Vol. 12, pp. 273-345.

Parnassian, N. A. (1983) 'The Development of the Grammatical Structure of Modern Armenian,' *The Annual of Armenian Linguistics*, pp. 35-45.

Պատմութիւն հայ գիծ գարութեան, (1932) Վենետիկ.

Պատմութիւն հայկական տպագրութեան (1513-1895), (1895), Վենետիկ pp 34-36. (Venice 1895 I).

Peeters, P. P. (1929) 'Pour l'histoire des origines de l'alphabet Arménien,' *REArm*, IX, 1, pp. 203-237.

Penna, A., (1946) Ambrogio Teseo: introduttore del siriasmo in Occidente,' Ordo canonicus Commentarium Ordinis can. reg. S. Augustini I pp. 142-157. VL: Racc. Gen. Dir. Cas. IV 1834. (see xerox)

Penna, A., (1946) `Ambrogio Teseo: introduttore del siriasmo in Occidente,' *Ordo canonicus Commentarium Ordinis can. reg. S. Augustini* , I pp. 142-157.

Pennoti, Gabriele, (1628)*Generalis Totius Sacri Ordinis Clericorum Canonic. Historia Tripartita:* Libro III `de Congr. Canonic. Saluatoris Lateraneii locupletissime disseritur', Rome, (ed. 1724).
Full citation (1628) Generalis Totius Sacri Ordinis Clericorum Canonic. Historia Tripartita Libro III de Congr. Canonic. Saluatoris Lateraneii locupletissime disseritur, Romae Ex Typographia Camerae Apostolicae MDCXXIIII (ed. 1724 is listing but seems to read 1624? Original is 1628.) VL: Ord. Rel. Folio IV Gen I cons.
p. 789 Caput quinquagesimumcuintum: Ambrosius, vel Theseus Ambrosius, ex Comitibus Albonesii, viris utriusque Doctor, Theologus, & omnium linguarum notitia peritissimus, cuius similes paucos Orbis vidit. qui iussus Leonis Decimi in Bononiensi Gymnasio linguarum Syriacae, & Chaldaicae scholam primus aperuit, cuius meminit Genebradus in Chronologia sub anno 1515.
Edidit Introductionem in Lingua Chaldaicam, Syriacam & Armenicam, ac decem alias linguas, & characterum differentium Alphabeta circiter quadraginta. lib. I Alia complura opera, statim edenda in promptu habeat, quae in immani clade Papiae sub Francisco Rege Gallorum perierunt. Obijt circa annum 1540. nam liber illo viuente fuit editus Papiae anno 1539.

Perixanån, A. (1966) «K voprosu o proisxo denij armånskoj pishmennosti» *Peredneazia†kij sbornik 2*, 103-133. This of the Armenian affricative sounds are Aramaic Tsade, which letter's shape was the importance of Ambrogio's concern with the Tsade and its descendants.
article makes the important point that almost all represented by letters descended from the taken from the Pahlavi alphabet. This confirms

Պիլոն Ճեքրայեցի (1892) *ճառք,* Վենետիկ.

Pingree, David (1989) 'Classical and Byzantine Astrology in Sassanian Persia,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* #43, pp. 226-239.

Polarci, E. (1909) *I verbi Italiani teorica e prontuario*, Milan.

Պողոսյան, Ֆ. Ղ. (1990) 'Կենսաբանական Տեսակետը Գրաբարի Ծագման հարցում,' *Հայաստանի Կենսաբանական հանդես*, 43, 4, 321-345. The author sees Grabar and its phonology as a reflection and expression of underlying natural laws within organic and inorganic systems.

Postel, G., (1538) *Linguarum duodecim* etc. VL: Mai XI M IV 67 int. 2

Postel, G., (1540) *Syriae descriptio*, LC: NP 0516143 (DLC MnU MH NjP

Postel, G., (1635). *De republica seu magistratibus Atheniensium*, Lugduni Batavorum, CIC (for backward C used in text)(=**M**) IC (=**D**) CXXXV   An argument for a return to Attic gov; the second copy of the same   with a discoursis   at the end on sources for Attic law. HNL: Ant. 1654; Ant. 1648.

Postel, G., (1656) *De cosmographia disciplina*, Lugduni Batavorum CICICCXXXVI
    Explanation of the Noah: Ham, Shem, Japheth division of mankind, languages, and geography. Bound with De   signorum coelestium. HNL: Geo. 550.
    pp. 71-72 Syrio & Armenis, qui Arymi & Eremi & Erembi, sic sensum Syria Aramine nomine corrupto dicti sunt, dicitur Armanly, sive   Armania nuncupatur: & Cythi, Cyprii...& Dodan, sive affinitate characterum in d Daleth, & r Ress, Rodanii, sunt in vicina sui patris habitatione onstitiusi populi.
    p. 74 Si Arapachitis regio Armeniae & Assyriae vicina, est ab Arpaxado nuncupata: & si Helamitae sive Elamitae, clarissimi in Perside populi:
    p. 155 An Armenian bishop in Japan (he is from Antioch).

Postel, Guillaume (1510-1581) *de foenicum literis,* seu De   prisco Latinae & Graecae
    lingua charactere, eiusque, antiquissima origine & usu, Paris 1552. VL: Barberini Y 1
    52.

Postel, Guillaume, (1552) *de foenicum literis, seu De prisco Latinae & Graecae lingua
    charactere, eiusque, antiquissima origine & usu*, Paris.
    Argument that the Phoenix of all alphabets were used in Gaul:
    11. Galli quorum facundia docuit Britannos (& nunquam contra quicquid   malevolus
in Galliam genius scribi curaverit) ideo merito nomen Aboriginum cum   Umbrus   eorum
Alumnus habuisse leguntur in Amiano Marcellinus &   Timagene.   Unde   quum   ab
Armenia per Syriam sanctam duce Iano venerit in   taliam gens Gallorum, teste Carone, &
inde ex Gallia in totam Europam sparserit,   suae primogenitura imperium, dubium non est,
quicquid de Troianis circumferatur,   quin hoc vocabuli ettam Britannis dederint.
    The point made is that all languages and writing must come from one source
    and that that source must be Hebrew and that Hebrew had   been written in an a
    ncient alphabet whose only remnant is the alphabet of the Samaritans (introduced into
    Europe through AT.
    See the two tables at the end of the book xeroxed.

Postel, Guillaume, (1538) *Linguarum duodecim characteribus differentium
    Alphabetum*, Paris.

Postel, Guillaume, (1538)*De originibus seu de Hebraicae linguae & gentis antiquitate, deque
    variarum linguarum affinitate*. Paris.

Postel, Guillaume (1510-1581) 3 vols. *De la republique des Turcs,* 1560/1565. Library of
    Congress (LC): NP 0516087 (DLC IU AU   NN);   Vittoria Emmanuale National
    Library, Rome (VENLR): JJK 40 card#67187 (iik or jjk or 11k or 77k for this is a
    Nineteenth Century card in script?). Ricardo Contini thinks that it must be jj.

Postel, G., *Sylloge altera scriptorum, qui linguae graecae*.. VENLR: 1.6.C.18 catalogue #67178P; VL: Mai XI.M.IV67 int. 2.

    Two collections of works are bound together:

    Sylloge Scriptorum qui de Linguae Graecae, Vera & Recta Pronuntiatione Commentarios reliquerunt, Videlicet: Adolphi Mekerchi, Theodori Bezae, Jacobi Ceratini & Henri Stephani

    Quibus accedunt Sigeberti Havercampi Dissertatio de Literarum Graecae--Lugduni Batavorum 1736.

    Sylloge Altera Scriptorum qui de Lingua Graecae: Vera & Recta Pronuntiatione Commentarios reliquerunt, Videlicet: Desiderii Erasmus, Stephani Vintoniensis, Johannes Checi, Thomae Smith, Gregorii Martini et Erasmi Schmidt; addendum Guillielmi Postelli de Phoenicum Literis. editor Sigebertus Havercampus--L.B. 1740. This copy of Postel lacks the chart found in the individual book.

Potken, Johannes (1511) *Psalterium David et Cantica aliqua*, Rome. The first Oriental language book published in Rome; also, the first book published in the Ethiopic syllabary.

Prabolta, Ciro, (1898) *Storia della Grammatica Italiana*, Milan, reprinted 1963.

Pullum, G. K. & W. A. Ladusaw (1986) *Phonetic Symbol Guide*, Chicago.

Rabin, Chaim ed. (1961) *Scripta Hierosolymitana: Volume VIII Studies in the Bible*, Jerusalem.

Rahlfs, Alfred ed. (1979) *Septuagint*, Stuttgart.

Ramat, Paolo et al. ed. (1986) *The History of Linguistics in Italy*, Benjamins.

Richard, Jean (1977) *La papaute et les missions d'orient au moyen age* (XIII-XV siecles) Rome. (Richard).

Rivola, F., (1624) *Grammaticae armenae libri quattor,* Milan Ambrosiana. VL: Racc. Gen.
    Oriente IV 589.

Rivola, Francesco, (1621) *Dictionarium armeno-latinum*, Milan Ambrosiana. VL: Racc. Gen.
    Oriente III 162.

Rivola, Francesco, (1633) *Dictionarium armeno-latinum*, Paris. (Matenadaran)

Robins, R. H. (1961) *A Short History of Linguistics*, Longmans, London.

Robinson, T. (1915) *Paradigms and Exercises in Syriac Grammar*, Oxford.

Rogerson, J. W. and J. W. McKay (1977) *The Cambridge Bible Commentary: Psalms 1-50*,
    Cambridge University.

Rolfs, Grammatica Historica della Lingua Italiana e degli Dialetti, vol 1 Fonetica.

Rosenthal, E. I. J. (1969) 'The Study of the Bible in Medieval Judaism,' *The Cambridge
History of the Bible,* Vol. 2, pp.252-279.

Rowley, H. H. ed. (1952) *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, Oxford.

Ruderman, David, (1988) *Kabbalah, Magic, and Science,* Harvard University Press.

Russell, j. R. (1994) 'On the Origins and Invention of the Armenian Script,' *Muséon*, Tome
    107 Fasc. 3-4 pp. 317-333.

Sabatini, Francescon, L'ortografia razionale. VL: Chigi Opuscoli   LXVI 1. (see xerox)

Salvioni, Carlo, Sul dialetti milanese. VL: Ling. Roman. IV 1 (30).

Սաղմոս ի Դաւիթ...ի Թուական Հայոց Ռմժե...ի մայրաքաղաքն ի
   Վանատիկ, ի Հայոց Հոգետունն...: This is the first Biblical   text
printed in the West. It was the work of Abgar dpir T'oxatec'i in   Venice in 1566.
The Matenadaran's copy is very badly damaged and can be used only through a very
poor microfilm negative of the highly damaged original.

Sampson, Geoffery, (1985) *Writing Systems,* Stanford University Press.

Sansovino, Francesco, (1568). Ortografia della voci della lingua nostra o Vero Dittionario
   Volgare et Latino, Venice VL: Barberini Y IX 76.

Schelhorn, Johann George, De Eximiis Svevorum in Orientalem Literaturam meritis,
   Amoenitates Literariae, Tome XIII pp. 486-500; Tome XVI p. 232. VL: Racc. Gen.
   Teologi V 6548 (1-4).

Schiltberger, J. (1427) *The Bondage and Travels of Johann Schiltberger, a Native of Bavaria*
   in Europe, Asia, and Africa, 1396-1427, London.

Schimmel, Annamarie (1993) *The Mystery of Numbers*, Oxford.

Schroeder, Joachim, (1711) *Thesaurus Linguae Armenicae: Antiquae et hodiernae,*
   Amstelodami.

Շրբմկ$ (1895) *Րստամ Նասիրութիւն Հայ Լեզուի և*
   Մատենագրա Տեան ԱՌԲ–ՄՃԶ, Վենետիկ. pp 40—42. (Venice
   1895 II) [A translation, summary and/or enlargement by Hayr Garagin Zorb. of G. A.
Schrumpf's essays on Armenology in Europe, which appeared in London in 1890.]

Schütz, Edmond, (1992) `The Evolution of Armenian Typographic Art in the West-European Period (16th-17th centuries)', *Atti del Quinto Simposio Internazionale di Arte Armena-1988*, Venice: San Lazzaro.

Schütz, Edmond, (1988) 'The Oscanian and Vanandian Type-Faces of the Armenian Printing Office in Amsterdam,' *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung. Tomus XLii* (2-3) pp. 161-220.

Secret (1961) `Notes sur Guillaume Postel', *Bibliotèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance,* Tome XXIII, 1961, Geneva pp.130-132.

Secret (1966) `Notes sur G.Postel', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, Tome XXVIII, 1966, Geneva pp. 698-699.

Secret, F., (1964) *Le Zôhar chez les Kabbalistes Chrétiens de la Renaissance*, Mouton: Paris.

Secret, F., Bibliographie des manuscripts (of GP), 1970. VL: Z8707.S33 cal.

Secret, Francois, Notes sur Guilliame Postel, 1963, VL: Racc. Gen. Vitae V 5856 (int. 5).

Segal, M. H. (1967) *The Pentateuch: Its Composition and Its Authorship*, Jerusalem.

Sellers, Ovid & E. E. Voigt (1941) *Biblical Hebrew,* Illinois.

Senese, Orazio Lombardelli (1568) *Della Pronvnzia Toscana*, Fiorenza.

Senner, W. ed. (1989) *The Origins of Writing*, Nebraska. A series of essays looking at the earliest examples of writing in the World's major cultures.

Shapiro (1991) *The Sense of Change,* The University of Indiana Press.

Shapiro, Michael, (1983) *The Sense of Grammar,* The University of Indiana Press.

Shaumyan   (1995) 'Dependency Relations and Applicative Universal Grammar,' in
    Dialogue 95: Computaional Linguistics and its Applications, Kazan, pp. 340-362.

Shaumyan, Sebastian, (1987) *A Semiotic Theory of Language,* University of Indiana Press.

Shirinian, Erna (1996) 'The Armenian Version of Aristotle's Categories in the Context of the
    Hellenizing School,' *Festschrift Prof. Dr. Dora Sakayan zum 65 Geburtstag*,
    Montreal pp. 134-141.

Shumaker, Wayne, (1972) *The Occult Sciences in the Renaissance: A Study in
    Intellectual Patterns*, University of California. This is a study of Renaissance belief in
    astrology, witchcraft, white magic, alchemy, and Hermes Trismegistus. It contains   an
important summary of Cornelius Agrippa's *De occulta philosophia libri tres*   (1531):
Agrippa was Potken's teacher.

Shumaker, Wayne, (1982) *Renaissance Curiosa,* Medieval &Renaissance   Texts & Studies,
    NY. Selections are given from the following works: John Dee's *Conversations with
    Angels*; Girolamo Cardano's *Horoscope of Christ*; Johannes Trithemius'
    Cryptography, and George Dalgarno's *Universal Language.*

Simonelli, Paolo, (1984) *La Lingua Adamo*. VL: Racc. Gen. Storia IV 19149 (7); VENLR:
    APC, 821. R. Contini notes that Tavoni has written a very   critical review.

Smitskamp, (1998) *Aethiops,* Leiden.

Smitskamp, R, (1991) *Philologia Orientalis,* Leiden. The book contains important
    descriptions of Potken's, Justiniani's, Reuchlin's, Ambrogio's,   Postel's and
    Bibliander's works on pp. 227-251.

Smitskamp, R, (1993) *Philologia Orientalis,* Leiden, PBI (Pontifical Biblical Institute):   I
34A 12.

Smitskamp, R, (1997) *Catalogue N° 611 Roma Victrix*, Leiden.

Solta, G. R. (1960) *Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der Indogermanischen
Sprachen*, Wien.

Steiner, George (1975) *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, Oxford.

Stewart, George (1975) *Names on the Globe*, Oxford.

Stone, M. (1990) *Fourth Ezra: a Commentary*, Minnesota.

Stone, M. ed. (1979) *The Armenian Versian of IV Ezra*, University of Pennsylvania
Armenian Texts and Studies no. 1.

Strohmeyer (1995b) `A Prolegomenon to the Study of the Armenian Material in Teseo
Ambrogio's Alphabetical Compendium', in *New Approaches to Medieval Armenian
Language and Literature*, ed. J. J. S. Weitenberg, Rodopi: Amsterdam.

Strohmeyer, V., (1995a) 'Armenian as Seen through the Eyes of Two Renaissance   Christian
Orientalists-cum-Kabbalists: Teseo Ambrogio and Guillaume Postel,'   Paper given at the
V International Conference on Armenian Linguistics, McGill,   Montreal, Canada, 1995.
(published in the proceedings).

Strohmeyer, V. (1996) 'The Armenian Manuscripts in the Personal Library of Teseo
Ambrogio degli Albonesi,' *Festschrift Prof. Dr. Dora Sakayan zum 65
Geburtstag*, Montreal pp. 145-160.

Ստրոմմայեր, Վ. (1995-1996) «Հայերէնը` ըստ կաբալիստ-
    արևելագետներ Թեզէռ Ամբրոջիոյի, Գիյոմ Պոստելի և
    Ֆրանչեսկո Ռիվոլլայի», *Իրան-Համէ*, Թիվ16-17

Strohmeyer, V. (1998) 'There Is More than Met Schroeder's Eye: the Hellenizing School and
    Clemente Galano,' *Iran and Caucasus II*, pp. 181-190.

Strohmeyer, V. (1998) 'Babken Choogaszean: The Man and the Armenologist,' *Studi
    sull'Oriente Cristiano*, 2 ₂ pp. 171-177.

Strong, J. (1984) *The New Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*, Nelson, New
    York.

Strothmann, Werner, (1971) Die Anfaenge der Syrischen Studien in Europa, Goettigen
    Oriental Studies, (check on   xerox). VL: Oriente II 67(1)   cons.

Talini, P., (1878) La basilica di S. Pietro in Ciel d'oro in Pavia, Archivo   Storico
    Lombardo, V, pp. 30-33 VL: Riv. Stor. 29. (see xerox). Decription of AT's
    tomb in the cathedral and incidentals about him.

Tavoni, M., Renaissance Linguistic Archives, Ferrara

Témisjian, K., Anna-Maria Folco, & N. Ouzounian ed. (1995) *La Langue   Arménienne
Défis et Enjeux*, Montreal.

Terenzio, P. (1860) Ambrogio Teseo degli Albonesi Pavese..., Pavia. VL: Italia Folio
    Pavia 3 (int. 1) cons. Not found on shelf.

Terenzio, P., (1860) *Ambrogio Teseo degli Albonesi Pavese...*, Pavia.

Terenzio, Pietro, (1862) *Notizie biografiche e linguistiche intorno ad Ambrogio Teseo Albonesi*, Pavia.

Terian, A., (1980) 'Syntactical Peculiarities of Translations of the Hellenizing School,' in J. A. C. Greppin, ed. *First International Conference on Armenian Linguistics: Proceedings*, New York, pp. 197-207.

Terian, A., (1982) 'The Hellenizing School, in N. G. Garsoian, ed. *East of Byzantium*, Washington, DC, pp. 175-186.

The Holy Bible: The King James Version, London.

The New English Bible with the Apocrypha, (1970) Oxford.

The Septuagint Veresion of the Old Testament with an English Translation, London.

The Syriac Bible, (1979), The Syrian Patriarchate, Damascus.

Thomson, R. (1996) *Rewriting Caucasian History: The Medieval Armenian Adaptation of the Georgian Chronicles*, Oxford.

Tirobaschi, Girolamo, (1833) *Storia della Litteratura Italiana*, vol. VI Milano, pp 108-117. VL: Chigi III 1043/Bibligrafia II Italia 45. (see xerox).

Tournebize, F. (1920-1921) 'Les Frères-Uniteurs,' *ROC* 22 pp. 145-161; pp. 249-279.

Umanesimo e ermeneutica, 1963, 3. VL: Racc. Gen. Periodici IV 4134.

Universal Lexicon, (1732) Halle and Leipzig, col. 1053 (Halle).

Վարդանյան, Ռ.Ճ. (1993) *Հայոց Տոմարական Եղանակը. Թարգմանական բնագրերի ժամանակը*, Երևան

Versteegh, C., Konrad Koerner, & H.J. Niederehe ed. (1983) *The History of Linguistics in the Near East*, Benjamins.

Voeoebus, Arthur (1975) *The Pentateuch in the Version of the Syro-Hexapla*, Louvain.

Wakefield, Robert, (1524) *Oratio de laudibus et utilitate trium linguarum,   Arabicae, Chaldaicae et Hebraicae (On the Three Languages),* London.

Walters, Peter (1973) *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendations*, Cambridge.

Weitenberg, J. J. (1994) 'Text Chronological Aspects of the Use of the Article -Ս and -Դ in the Gospel Manuscripts M and E,' in Ajamian, S. ed. *Text   and Context*, University of Pennsylvania, pp. 97-114.

Wheatcroft, Andrew (1993) *The Ottomans*, Viking.

Whiston, W. & G. (1736) *Mosis Chorenensis Historiae Armeniacae- Libri III Accedit ejusdem Scriptoris Epitome Geographiae Praemittitur Praefatio quae de Literatura, ac Versione Sacra Armeniaca agit; et Subjicitur Appendix, quae continet Epistolas Duas Armeniacas, Primam, Corinthiorum ad Paulam Apostolum, Alteram, Pauli Apostoli ad Corinthios; nunc primum ex Codice MS integre divulgatas*, London.

Whiston, W. (1867) *The Complete Works of Flavius Josephus*, Edinburg.

Wigram (1984) *The New Englishman's Hebrew Concordance*, Hendrickson, Mass.

Wilkinson, J. (1971) *Egeria's Travels*, London. The earliest record of a   pilgramage to Jerusalem (5th century).

Widmanstetter, Johann Albrecht von (1506-1557), *Syriacae Linguae Novi   Testamentum,* Vienna, 1555, ed. 1562. VL: Barberini A VIII 49 (2).
        The Introduction is addressed to Emperor Ferdinand by Widmanstetter.
        pp. with continuo Concilium-ret 9 pages starting from right to left   concerned with Ambrogio Teseo.
        pp. A-Gij: Appendix of Syriac Grammar with extensive transcription. (see xerox)

Wright, W. (1894) *A Short History of Syriac Literature*, London.

Ye'or, Bat (1996) *The Decline of Eastern Christianity under Islam: From Jihad to Dhimmitude*, Madison.

Virgil B. Strohmeyer

The Importance of Teseo Ambrogio degli Albonesi's Selected Armenian Materials for the Development of the Renaissance's Perennial Philosophy and an Armenological Philosophical Tradition

Editor-in-Charge:

Bert Vaux, Ph.D.